REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 525 UD 004 749

EXPANSION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM.
BY- FOX, DAVID J.
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.
PUB DATE SEP 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$7.32 181P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS, *INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, *ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, TABLES (DATA), OBSERVATION, INTERVIEWS, LESSON OBSERVATION CRITERIA, TESTS, STUDENT ATTITUDES, ARITHMETIC, READING ACHIEVEMENT, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, CONTROL GROUPS, SPECIAL SERVICES, ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, ATTITUDES, TEACHER EVALUATION, INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT, NEW YORK CITY, MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS, ESEA TITLE I, METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

THIS SHORT-TERM EVALUATION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS (MES) PROGRAM IN 21 NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS ASSESSED THE MES INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM AND ITS IMPACT ON THE STUDENTS. DATA WERE GATHERED FROM (1) OBSERVATIONAL VISITS TO CLASSROOMS BY TWO-MEMBER TEAMS OF EDUCATORS AND SOCIAL SCIENTISTS, (2) STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND TEACHING STAFF, (3) INVENTORIES ADMINISTERED TO THE CHILDREN TO ASSESS THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF SELF AND SCHOOL, AND (4) STUDENT'S SCORES ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST IN ARITHMETIC AND READING. DATA WERE ALSO COLLECTED ABOUT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR, CLASS SIZE, GROUPING PRACTICES, SCHOOL CLIMATE, ETHNIC COMPOSITION, ATTENDANCE, AND COSTS. THESE DATA WERE COMPARED WITH EVALUATIVE DATA FROM EIGHT CONTROL SCHOOLS AND FROM THE 1966-67 EVALUATION OF THE FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM. IT WAS FOUND THAT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM VARIED CONSIDERABLY WITH EACH SCHOOL, BUT THE GENERAL MES ATMOSPHERE AND STAFF, PARENT, AND COMMUNITY ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PROGRAM WERE ALL ENTHUSIASTIC AND OPTIMISTIC. HOWEVER THE PROGRAM HAD HAD NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND THE GAINS PER ACADEMIC YEAR WHICH HAD BEEN NOTED IN PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS WERE NOT BEING MAINTAINED. CHILDREN WHO HAD BEEN IN THE MES PROGRAM FOR THREE YEARS WERE EVEN FURTHER BEHIND NORMAL STANDARDS THAN WHEN THEY HAD BEGUN. THUS, ALTHOUGH ADMINISTRATIVE RESTRUCTURING (SMALLER CLASSES, SPECIAL SERVICES, ETC.) CREATED A GENERAL OPTIMISM, THE ABSENCE OF ANY SUCH RESTRUCTURING IN CURRICULUM AND IN BASIC TEACHING METHODS RESTRICTED PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT. (LB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED014525

[redacted]

04749

EVALUATION OF NEW YORK CITY TITLE I
EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS 1966-67

EXPANSION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM

By David J. Fox

September 1967

UD004749

The Center For Urban Education
33 West 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10036

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

EXPANSION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM

David J. Fox

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1966-67 school year.

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director
George Weinberg, Title I Coordinator

September 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Topic	Page
I	Introduction	1
II	Procedure	5
III	Children's Functioning	32
IV	Evaluation of Teacher Functioning	69
V	Evaluation of School Attractiveness, Climate, and Quality, and the Special Features of the MES Program	81
VI	Evaluation of the MES Program in the Early Childhood Grades	89
VII	Evaluation of the Reactions and Opinions of Administrative, Teaching and Supplementary Professional Staff	101
VIII	Conclusions	120
	Appendix A - Statistics Describing Selected Aspects of the Program	A1
	Appendix B - Instruments	B1
	Appendix C - Research Staff	C1

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This is the final report of the evaluation of the program called More Effective Schools (hereafter referred to as MES) conducted in 21 New York City elementary schools during the 1966-67 school year. This evaluation was concerned primarily with estimating the quality of the in-class instructional program provided in MES, determining its effects on the children participating, and contrasting both with the quality and effects in a set of eight schools designated as "control" schools for the evaluation of the MES program, selected because of their similarity to an ME school in terms of location and pupil population.

The MES Program

The More Effective Schools Program was originally detailed in a Report to the Superintendent of Schools from a Joint Planning Committee established by then Superintendent of Schools Calvin Gross.[1] This Committee, charged with the responsibility "for setting up a program for more effective schools,"[2] recommended a multi-faceted program involving basic changes in four areas, "pupils and curriculum...personnel...school plant and organization... (and) community relations."[3] Within these areas, the report went on to detail twenty statements to guide policy in establishing the program, involving such specifics as selecting participating schools to maximize the likelihood of integration, setting a maximum class size of 22, providing teacher specialists, grouping classes heterogeneously, instituting team teaching, and emphasizing school-community relationships.

---

[1] Report of the Joint Planning Committee for More Effective Schools to the Superintendent of Schools, May 15, 1964, New York City Public Schools.

[2] Ibid, p. i.

[3] Ibid, p. ii,iii.

The More Effective Schools program was first established in September 1964, in ten schools. It has been in existence in these schools ever since. These schools, therefore, have had the MES program for three full academic years and will be referred to in this report as the "Old" ME schools. In September 1965, the program was expanded to include 11 more schools, and so has been in existence in these schools for two years. These 11 schools will be referred to as the "New" ME schools.

The 1966-67 Evaluation: Orientation and Philosophy

In its brief existence, MES has been evaluated three times. In October 1965, the administrative staff of the program prepared a memorandum[4] to the Superintendent of Schools reporting on the first year of the MES program. In August 1966, the Center for Urban Education reported the results of a limited evaluation it conducted at the conclusion of the 1965-66 school year.[5] In September 1966, the Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education reported the results of its evaluation of MES for this same 1965-66 school year.[6] In planning this fourth evaluation of MES, covering the 1966-67 school year, the evaluation staff used these previous studies as both guides and foundations. Thus we studied some aspects of the program such as ethnic composition of schools, and achievement in arithmetic and reading, even though these were previously studied, so as to provide continuity in these evaluations throughout the three years of MES. We omitted other potential aspects for study, such as parental response, in the belief that parental enthusiasm and support for MES had already been documented and evidenced. Most important, we designed this evaluation to emphasize the placing of observers in classes in order to obtain structured observations of in-class functioning, a technique for evaluation not emphasized in the previous studied.

---

[4] Memorandum on the first year of the More Effective Schools Program 1964-5 to Superintendent of Schools, New York City Board of Education, October, 1965.

[5] The More Effective Schools Program, Center For Urban Education, August 31, 1966.

In planning this evaluation and preparing this report, we have tried to keep in mind that the program being evaluated originally came into existence a few months after the publication of the report recommending it, and had been in existence only two years when we began our study in the fall of 1966. Indeed, in reading this report, the leader should understand that this evaluation belongs to the family of short-term evaluations conducted in the early years of a new program. Such evaluations cannot be considered definitive studies of a program's worth, but rather as short-term evaluations, that have their place in identifying the initial impact of a program, providing evidence of its potential strengths and weaknesses, and providing a basis for predicting its ultimate effect. We present data in that spirit, and hope that it will be read and discussed in a similar light.

---

[6] Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program Summary Report, Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, September 1966.

A final introductory comment: throughout the study we received complete freedom and cooperation from the central staff at the Center for Urban Education, from the central administrative staff for MES, and from the Bureau of Research of the New York City Board of Education. The principals of the ME and control schools who participated in the study, while reserving their right to disagree with the sense of some of our research procedures, nevertheless made their schools fully available for study. Considering the year-long nature of the evaluation, and the consequent year-long nature of our requests to send in observers and examiners, the cooperation we received from them was outstanding and we wish to acknowledge it gratefully.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

Overview

The basic purpose of the evaluation was to estimate the effectiveness with which the ME schools functioned. We did this with four major kinds of data. First, we built the study around a three-part series of observational visits to schools by two-person teams consisting of either two professional educators or one educator and one social scientist. The visits were conducted throughout the year, beginning in December and concluding in May. During each of the three visits, the observers visited classes and rated the quality of classroom functioning using structured rating scales. At the second and third visits, the same observers obtained a second kind of data by interviewing administrative and teaching staff, using a structured interview guide to obtain staff appraisal of their own selective roles and of the program. The third kind of data consisted of children's perceptions of self and school, obtained by project staff administering paper and pencil inventories to the children in the upper grades of all ME schools. The final type of data to be discussed here are those obtained by administration of sub-tests in arithmetic and reading from the Metropolitan Achievement Battery.

In the control schools, the same research plan was followed except that two, rather than three visits were made to each school, one, near mid-year for observation of classes, and a second in May, to administer the paper and pencil inventories to the children.

The original design for this study included a fifth kind of data, a retrospective survey of children's achievement, and of rated school functioning using the Cumulative Record Card. It was planned to collect these data during the summer months when the record cards would not otherwise be used. In early June, we were notified by the Board of Education that this plan was no longer considered feasible and we had sufficient time available to collect only one piece of background data, and only in ME schools. We were able to send in clerical teams to ME schools to determine the year in which each child in grades four, five, and six entered his present school. This information was used to provide some insight into the relative achievement of children who did and did not have continuous education in ME schools.

The Observational Visits

The three-part cycle of observational visits were conducted in December -January, February-March, and in May. At each of these times, observational teams visited classes in grades three through six. During the February-March visit, different teams, selected because of their professional specialization in early childhood education, visited classes from prekindergarten through second grade.

The Observers

The evaluation in the middle and upper elementary grades involved thirty observers. Of these thirty, 23 were educators and 7 were social scientists. The educators represented two different aspects of professional education. Sixteen were faculty members of colleges and universities, representing Departments or Schools of Education. All 16 were currently participating in teacher education programs, and all had current and direct contact with urban public school systems, particularly New York City. Each of the other seven educators was the director of an independent private school in New York City. These observers were recruited to represent the point of view of the school administrator as well as the point of view of the independent school educator. The social scientists were psychologists or sociologists selected because they combined academic training in their own discipline with professional affiliations with teacher education programs. Thus, all observers had immediate and current contact with the New York City public schools. Generally, each observation team consisted of two of the three types of observers used.

Data from the first visit were analyzed separately by type of observer, to determine if observer background made a difference in the qualitative evaluations. There were only isolated differences among the three types of observers, with no differences between the faculty members who were educators and those who were social scientists. There were occasional differences on specific items between the faculty groups and the independent school heads, with all of these differences reflecting a tendency for the independent school heads to give more positive ratings than either of the faculty groups. Since the similarities and consistencies far outweighed these few differences, we decided to combine the data from the three types of observers. In this report, therefore, data will be reported based on all observers combined.

The same observers were used throughout the year of the study. Thus, when we refer to observational data collected from ME and from control schools, these data were obtained from the same observers visiting both types of schools. Similarly, when references are made to observational data obtained from the three visits made during the year, these data, too, were obtained from the same observers. In most instances the same observational team was sent back to the same schools throughout the year so that rapport and relationships established during the first visit could be built upon in later visits.[1]

An orientation session was held for all observers prior to their going to the schools. At this session, the purpose of the study was explained and the instruments were distributed and reviewed. Continuous communication was maintained with the observers throughout the study, and revisions were made in instruments for succeeding visits in the light of observers' suggestions. At the orientation session one member of each observational team was designated as the team leader, responsible for coordinating the activities of the team with the school administration. To minimize the necessity for on-the-spot decision making, a special telephone line was installed so that observational teams would always be able to reach the project office. At the completion of the project, a final session was held with the observers. At this session, the project coordinator fed back to the observers the sense of the observer data as project staff interpreted it and as it is presented in this report. The observers agreed that these interpretations did reflect their perceptions and evaluations of the schools that they had visited.

The Selection of Classes to be Observed

The procedure for selecting classes to be observed was different at each MES visit. For the first visit, a member of the project staff used the school organization sheet to randomly select for an observational visit one class at each grade from third through sixth. Additional classes were randomly selected from those grades with the largest number of classes, so that six classes were randomly selected from each school. The principal was then told which classes had been selected and was asked to add three other classes by whatever process or criteria he chose. This practice was followed since the primary purpose of these visits was to obtain a balanced view of the school, and random selection did not assure us that perception. The process of random selection assures bias-free selection, but with the small numbers involved here, typically no more than four or five classes per grade, random selection does not assure a representative sample. We asked the principal then to consider the classes we had selected and add whatever classes he thought we should see in order to produce a more balanced picture of his school. Of the 180 classes selected for the first visit, 172 were actually observed. The eight classes lost were due mostly to teacher absences, with one or two unexpected trips producing an observer but not a class! In some instances when a teacher was absent the principal suggested an alternate class which could be observed. In the final breakdown, project staff selected 104 of the classes observed at the first visit and principals selected 68. Considering grade in school, the 172 classes observed broke down into 51 each at grades three, four, five, and 19 in grade six. This variation in grade six will hold throughout the study as only 12 of the 21 schools had sixth-grade classes.

---

[1] At different points in this report reference will be made to observational data collected during the 1966-67 evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program. These data were collected by the same observers used in the evaluation of MES.

The second visit involved observations of 74 classes. During this visit we wished to see classes when our observers were not expected and so project staff selected all 74 classes to be observed. The principal was informed only of the date of the visit, and of the fact that the observers would want to drop in on classes during the day. The 74 classes involved 21 classes at the third and fifth grades, 22 in the fourth, and ten in the sixth grade.

Three different types of classes were seen during this second visit. Forty-eight were classes that had been observed during the first visit. We wanted to see ten of them again because the observer had noted that he did not consider the first lesson observed typical of normal classroom functioning. We wanted to see another 38 again, because the first time they had been rated as extremely good or extremely poor, and we wanted to obtain some estimate of the stability of these extreme ratings. Finally, 26 were classes randomly selected in order to provide continuity to the observational data.

During the third visit, 67 classes were observed. The same procedure was followed as in the second visit, in that project staff selected all classes and principals were not informed of the classes selected. By grade, the classes seen during the third visit involved 10 in the third grade, 15 in the fourth, 20 in the fifth, 9 in the sixth, and 13 composed of children in more than one grade, taught by a specialist.

Table 1 summarizes these data for grades three to six. As can be seen there, the evaluation of the MES program in the middle and upper elementary grades is based on 300 observational visits to classes, all but 68 selected by project staff.

At the same point in time as the second visit to the upper elementary grades, a special team of observers, selected because of their specialization in early childhood education, was sent into six of the ME schools to observe prekindergarten through grade two. Sixty-eight classes were observed in this phase of the project: 13 prekindergarten, 16 kindergarten, 20 in first grade,

Table 1

Number of Classes Seen in Middle
and Upper Elementary Grades in MES
by Visit, Grade in School,
and Selector

	Visit				
	One		Two	Three	
Grade in School	Selected by Project	Selected by Princ.	Selected by Project	Selected by Project	All Visits
3	34	17	21	10	82
4	30	21	22	15	88
5	29	22	21	20	92
6	11	8	10	9	38
Total	104	68	74	54[a]	300

[a] Thirteen classes were composed of children in more than one grade, taught by a specialist.

and 19 in second grade. In selecting these classes for observation, the procedure for the first visit was used; i.e., project staff randomly selected two-thirds of the classes and principals were then notified of our selection and invited to select the final third of the classes. Because of absences and some late scheduling changes of the eventual 68 classes seen, 39 were selected by project staff and 29 by the principals. Then during the third visit, an additional 23 classes were seen, consisting of 1 kindergarten, 9 first grades, and 12 second grades. All 23 of these classes were chosen by project staff. In all, 91 classes were seen in the early childhood years.

In eight control schools, as was noted earlier in this section, two visits were conducted with only the first visit in January devoted to class observations. This visit was scheduled in the same manner as was the first visit in MES; six classes were randomly selected by the project staff and the principal was invited to add three others after learning which six we had selected. Of the 72 classes selected in this way, 68 were actually observed, 44 selected by project staff, and 24 selected by the principal. By grade, these involved 24 classes in grade three, 19 in grade four, 17 in grade five, and 8 in the four control schools that included grade six.

Table 2 summarizes the number of classes seen in the control schools, by grade and by selector.

The Instruments

Nine research instruments were used during this study. Each of them will be discussed and its role in the evaluation explained.

Table 2

Number of Classes Seen in Middle and Upper Elementary Grades in Control Schools, by Grade in School, and Selector

Grade in School	Selected by Project	Selected by Principal	Total
3	14	10	24
4	15	4	19
5	11	6	17
6	4	4	[illegible]
Total	44	24	68

1) The Individual Lesson Observation Report (hereafter referred to as the ILOR).

This instrument was the basic device for obtaining the observers' perceptions of the lessons observed. The ILOR consists of two sections, one providing the details of the lesson observed and the other containing 18 rating scales covering specific aspects of the lesson. In the first section, the observer was asked to indicate the subject field of the lesson, who taught the lesson, the length of the observation, and whether or not the observer saw the entire lesson. Finally, the observer was asked to indicate whether or not he perceived this lesson as "typical of normal functioning in this classroom." Throughout the study, about two-thirds of the lessons were rated as being "completely typical" and another one-fourth as being a "reasonable approximation" of what usually took place in the classroom. At each visit then, five or six per cent of the lessons were rated as "less than a reasonable approximation" of normal functioning in the classroom.[2] Most often these ratings involved some special activity or a non-teaching activity. In only isolated instances did the rating reflect the observer's judgment that he was watching a lesson particularly developed for his benefit.

The second section of the ILOR was developed to cover four areas of classroom functioning involving the teacher, and a fifth involving the children. The four areas involving teacher functioning were: 1) Planning and Organization (2 items); 2) Provision for Continuity and

---

[2] These classes rated as not typical during the first visit were selected for observation during the second visit. In no case was the rating repeated, although the observer was different and did not know of the first rating.

and Independent Work (4 items); 3) Adaptation to and Utilization of Class Size (2 items); and 4) Creativity and Quality of Instruction (5 items). The fifth area consisted of five items on children's functioning.

The basic rating scale used was a five-point scale centered around a midpoint considered "average." Above this midpoint were two ratings, one labeled "above average," and an extreme positive rating labeled "outstanding." Below the average midpoint were two parallel negative ratings, one labeled "below average" or "poor," and the negative extreme, usually labeled "extremely poor." More important than the labels, was the fact that during the briefing of the observers the five-point scale was explained as ranging from atypically good to atypically bad, around the average midpoint.

Reliability and Validity of the ILOR

No attempt is made on the ILOR to delineate or describe for the observer what each of the rating scale points means in terms of actual classroom behavior. Nor was any effort made to do this during the briefing. This means that each observer brought to the observation his own perception of quality functioning in each area. The value of these data then rests on the reliability of such judgments by independent observers. Estimates of this reliability are available from two sources. The ILOR was first used in the 1966-67 evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program. Here, estimates of its reliability were provided by having two observers see and rate the same class, and computing the per cent of time they assigned ratings which were identical or within one scale point. For different aspects of the ILOR, these estimates were 90.6 per cent and 96.4 per cent. This same procedure was followed in this evaluation of MES. In each visit to each school, one class was randomly selected to be seen by the two observers who completed the ILOR independently. Analysis of these data indicate that overall, the observers either gave the same rating or ratings one point apart, 95 per cent of the time. For the items on teacher functioning, the estimate of reliability was 96.4 per cent and for the items on children's functioning 92.7 per cent. Moreover, almost all of the discrepancies of a single scale point involved differences within the same quality of evaluation, e.g., a difference between a rating of 1 representing "outstanding" and a rating of 2 representing "above average."

Thus the data from both these studies suggest that the ILOR produces reliable ratings of the phenomena being observed, despite the lack of any definitions of gradations of quality.

In addition to these reliability estimates based upon independent ratings of the same lessons, we noted earlier in this section that we sought to estimate the stability of extremely positive or negative ratings on the ILOR over a period of time. To accomplish this, we selected a sample of classes rated during the first visit at either the positive or negative extreme of the scale on quality of instruction. During the second visit we sent a different observer to these classes. The observer had no knowledge that the class had been seen before, and if he discovered this during the visit, had no basis for knowing why it was being seen a second time. The two sets of ratings were compared for these 38 classes and were identical, or within one scale point of each other 81 per cent of the time. This indicates that the observer's judgment of extreme high or low quality instruction is reasonably stable over time.

As to validity, the ILOR can only be defended in terms of validity of content. The basic source of the 18 aspects of classroom functioning which were evaluated were the objectives stated or implied in the project proposal for More Effective Schools. These were supplemented by some criteria added by project staff and our consultants.

2) The Teacher Behavior Record

The observers rated teacher's attitude and in-class behavior using the Teacher Behavior Record (TBR), an instrument developed by Ryans.[3] This instrument asks the observer to rate the teacher on 19 different attitudinal or behavioral characteristics. For each characteristic opposite behaviors are described both through single adjectives (e.g., unsympathetic, understanding), and through a brief explanation of each extreme. The observer is offered a seven-point rating scale for each characteristic.

Reliability and Validity of the TBR

In his book, Ryans reports varied estimates of reliability for the scale.[4] For the 19 separate subscales, he reports reliabilities ranging from .60 to .86, and for the composite scale he reports reliability estimates ranging from .64 to .70.

For the use to which we put the TBR, reliability can also be estimated from the 1965-66 study of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program in which it was used, and from the current study, in each case based on pairs of independent ratings. In the Open Enrollment study, for ratings of 21 teachers, the ratings were identical or one scale point apart 76.4 per cent of the time, and two scale points apart 18.3 per cent of the time. Thus they differed more than two points only 5.3 per cent of the time. Similar data are available from the current study, and indicate slightly higher consistency. In this study, 80.6 per cent of the pairs of ratings for 19 teachers were identical to within one scale point, and another 15.8 per cent were within two points, with only 3.6 per cent three points apart, and none more than this.

---

[3] Ryans, D.G. Characteristics of Teachers, American Council on Education, (Washington, D.C., 1960) pp.414.

[4] Ibid, pp. 107-121.

3) The General School Report

At the completion of the first visit, each observer independently completed a second instrument, called the General School Report (GSR). The GSR consisted of four sections. In the first section, the observer was asked to rate two special features of the MES program; reduced class size and heterogeneous groupings. He was then asked to rate the extent and the effectiveness with which he had seen these features used. The second section was designed to obtain some estimate of the overall climate and character of the school. This section consisted of eight items using the basic five-point rating scale used in the ILOR. Two of these items involved the physical attractiveness of the school and the classes; the other six covered aspects of school climate, in general, and specifically, attitudes of administrative and teaching staff and children. The third section of the GSR offered the observer the chance to list the effective features of MES as well as the problems he saw in the school which he considered peculiar to MES. The final section of the GSR asked the observer to indicate his overall appraisal of MES, based on this visit, assuming that the instruction he had seen was typical of all MES schools. There were three items designed to obtain this overall estimate: one asked how the observer would feel about having a child of his own in the school, one asked for an opinion of what should be done about MES, and one asked for an opinion as to whether the instruction he had seen was superior to that offered in the typical school.

In the control schools, the GSR was briefer, since the first and third sections referring specifically to MES were eliminated.

Reliability and Validity of the GSR

The reliability of the GSR can be directly estimated due to the fact that in each school two observers completed it independently.

Reliability was estimated only for the items on climate and attitude since the observer's perception of physical attractiveness might well have been different since they were in different classrooms. The pairs of ratings on climate and attitude were identical or within one scale point of each other 91 per cent of the time. Equally important, all but two of the larger discrepancies involved one observer giving a rating of average while the other gave an extreme rating. Thus, only twice in 120 pairs of ratings did the observers differ in the quality of their ratings and both these discrepancies involved the same two observers in the same school.

On the third section, the overall ratings of the program were based on its functioning in the school just seen. These ratings were identical or to within one scale point of each other 90 per cent of the time, and here too there were only two instances of qualitatively different responses.

In general, then, the GSR demonstrated satisfactory reliability, as the estimates obtained were consistently high and as the discrepancies which did occur seldom reflected observers coming to opposite conclusions.

The validity of the GSR, like that of the ILOR, rests on the content it includes. The first section has its origin in the basic description of MES, and the criteria included in the later sections stem both from the MES project proposal and the perceptions of project staff.

4) The Teacher Questionnaire

In an effort to obtain a wide basis for estimating teacher reaction to MES, a paper and pencil questionnaire was prepared and mailed to all 1143 classroom and cluster teachers[5] listed on the school organization sheets given to us. Of these, 371 were returned to the project in the stamped envelope provided, a return of 32.4 per cent. This is a reasonable return for a mailed questionnaire, but was disappointing in this instance, since we had assumed that staff involvement in the future of MES would motivate a large proportion of the teachers to take the opportunity to express their opinion for the record. For reasons we cannot estimate, they did not take the opportunity in proportions much larger than people typically do when mailed a questionnaire.

There were no differences in the proportion of returns from the schools which had MES three years compared to those which had had MES only two years. There were differences, however, for the different grades taught. The low returns came from teachers in kindergarten (26 per cent), grade one (29 per cent) and grade four (30 per cent), with the higher response from the teachers in grade six (43 per cent) and prekindergarten (48 per cent). No pattern is indicated in these differences and so they are most probably chance fluctuations. Somewhat larger proportions of regular classroom teachers (34 per cent) returned the questionnaire than of cluster teachers (27 per cent), but this too seems to us to be a statistic of limited educational significance.

The questionnaire, deliberately kept brief, covered three areas: 1) descriptive information about the background experience and current position of the teacher; 2) a general appraisal of MES and of ten specific features of the program, and 3) the teacher's perception of the strengths and weaknesses of MES and his recommendations to improve the program. It concluded by asking if the teacher were willing to be interviewed to discuss his views further. Of the 371 who returned the questionnaire, 271 or 58 per cent said they were willing, 115 or 31 per cent said they were not, and the other 39 (11 per cent) left the item blank. All teachers interviewed subsequently were selected from the 271 who had said they were willing.

---

[5] A cluster teacher is an additional teacher assigned to work with a group of three other teachers on a regular basis, to relieve these teachers for preparation time; to allow for work with smaller groups in a class.

5) The Administration and Staff Interview Guides

To provide administrative and teaching staff and specialists with an opportunity to express their opinions about MES, half of the observers' time during the second and third visits was devoted to conducting individual face-to-face interviews with these members of the school faculty. These were structured interviews, in which the observer was given a specific list of questions to ask. For many questions, the guide also provided options for the observer to categorize the nature of the response and, where appropriate, rate the opinion expressed on a positive-negative scale. During their briefing, it was made clear to the observers that they were free to ask as many additional questions as necessary for clarification. Thus they were encouraged to continue to ask questions until they felt comfortable about the categorization or rating.

The interview guides for teachers and specialists were intended to cover seven areas: 1) the respondent's opinions about MES in general and as implemented in his present school, 2) his perceptions of the orientation and/or special training received for MES, 3) changes made as a result of MES in areas like curriculum and methods of instruction, 4) his perception of changes in children's functioning and attitudes, 5) his perception of the changes in parent-school relationships, 6) his opinions as to differences in his own role and functioning in an MES as opposed to a regular school, and 7) the strengths and weaknesses of MES and recommendations for improving the program.

The interview guide for the principal covered these same seven areas. The area of parental response was covered in much greater detail, as the principal was asked to describe his efforts to establish school-parent relationships. In addition, he was asked about how MES was introduced into the school and his reaction to the administrative aspects of the program.

During the second visit, interviews were conducted with all twenty of the principals in schools which had middle and upper elementary grades. At this same time, interviews were also conducted with 38 assistant principals (at least one in every school), 19 guidance counselors, 16 reading sepcialists, 9 community coordinators, 6 school psychologists, 5 social workers, 5 audiovisual specialists, and 22 other specialists in health, speech, music, art, and library, with no more than four interviewed in any one specialty.

Teacher interviews were conducted at the third visit. Again the observers used about half of their time in each school to conduct these interviews. A total of 81 interviews with teachers were conducted using the basic outline discussed above. Since it was not possible to interview all 271 teachers who had indicated a willingness to be interviewed, some basis for selecting had to be developed. It was decided to use the teachers' overall opinion about MES (as expressed on the questionnaire) and the grade she was teaching as the basis for selection. Since only 12 teachers had expressed negative opinions about MES, it was decided to interview all seven of these 12 who had said they were willing. Similarly, all 15 willing to be interviewed of the 24 who had only "slightly positive" feelings were interviewed. The sample was completed by randomly selecting a 15 per cent sample of those with strongly positive feelings to represent the different grade levels.

It is important to note, however, that because of this selection procees the sample of teachers ultimately interviewed cannot be considered a randomly selected sample of those who said they were willing. The small proportion with negative or slightly positive feelings is more fully represented than the large majority (86 per cent) with "strongly" or "completely positive" feelings. In the presentation of the data from the interviews with teachers, this point should be kept in mind.

6) Children's Perception of Class, School, and Schooling

To obtain some estimate of how the children in the ME and control schools felt about their school, their class, and their own place in the educational process, two paper and pencil inventories were used, one entitled My Class, and the other My School. My Class consists of twenty descriptive statements about class and classmates, to which children can either agree, disagree, or indicate uncertainty. Ten of the statements are phrased positively, and ten negatively. The instrument can be, and was, analyzed to yield both the response pattern to each item and a total score for each child expressing his general orientation on a positive-negative continuum. My School is a similar inventory, except that the 17 statements that comprise it are oriented to school, school staff, and the child's own perception of himself as a learner, in general and during the past year. This inventory offers the child two gradations of a positive response and two of a negative response. It was analyzed in terms of item response patterns only.

These inventories were used only in grades four, five, and six. Every child present on the day when they were administered received one of them. Within each grade in each ME and control school, classes were randomly assigned to receive either My Class or My School. Even though these were used only in the upper grades, children were paced through the inventory by a project staff member who read each item aloud. To maximize the likelihood of frank responses, teachers were asked to leave the room while the inventories were being completed.

No data are available on the reliability of these inventories. Some indication of the stability of My Class is provided by the fact that it was used in two studies of the children in the Free Choice Open Enrollment program. These studies, conducted two years apart, nevertheless reported similar, and often nearly identical data, both for the item response patterns and the distribution of total scores on the positive-negative continuum.

7,8) Children's Achievement in Reading and Arithmetic

The estimates of children's academic achievement reported in this study are all obtained from the administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading and in Arithmetic. The tests in reading were administered in October 1966, and again in April of 1967. The test in arithmetic was administered in March of 1967. These three administrations were part of the citywide testing program. The tests were given in class by the regular classroom teacher. They were scored by the test scoring service provided by the publisher. Through provision made by the Center for Urban Education and the cooperation of the Bureau of Research of the New York City Board of Education, copies of all data were transmitted directly to the project staff.

Our initial analyses of these current data, and particularly comparison of the April 1966 reading scores with the October 1966 reading scores, suggested that in ME schools there was evidence of a decline in reading level from the levels achieved in April to the levels reported in October. Therefore, we requested permission from the Board of Education to permit project staff to test a sample of classes in MES schools in June 1967 to determine if progress continued after April and the decline came over the summer months, or if there was evidence of some tapering off as early as June. This permission was granted. In early June, therefore, an alternate form of the Metropolitan Reading test was administered by project staff in 218 classes in grades two through six of the twenty MES schools with such grades.

The publishers of the Metropolitan Reading Tests offer two different sets of norms by which standard scores can be converted into grade equivalents. One of these sets is used to convert scores using national norms. The second set has been developed for use in large urban centers where the proportions of transient and mobile pupils and of disadvantaged pupils make the use of the national norms of doubtful validity. For any one score, the use of the urban norms results in a grade equivalent .1 or .2 higher than that obtained through the use of the national norms. Since the test scoring service involved used the urban norms as the basis for determining grade equivalents, the data reported here on achievement in reading are .1 to .2 higher than they would be if national norms had been used. This reference will be provided the reader in the section reporting these data.

Two other points are important to keep in mind in evaluating the achievement data reported here. The Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading come in several levels. Three levels were used in the schools being studied here: the Upper Primary level used in grade two, the

Elementary level used in grade three and four, and the Intermediate level used in grades five and six. Each of these levels has both a "floor" and a "ceiling," in the sense that there is both a minimum and maximum grade level a child can achieve. For example, on the Upper Primary and Elementary levels, a child who gets no items correct will nevertheless obtain a reading grade equivalent of 1.0. On the Intermediate level, this minimum reading grade equivalent is 3.0. At the opposite end of the scale, a child who turns in a perfect paper on the Intermediate level cannot achieve a reading grade equivalent above 10.0, and the maximum on the Elementary level is a reading grade equivalent of 7.9. Because of this curtailment at both ends of the distribution, we have reported averages in terms of medians throughout the sections reporting these data.

Another critical aspect of the Metropolitan Tests which should be understood in evaluating these results is that each item the child answers correctly is converted to .1 of a reading grade and in some instances a single item is converted to .2 of a reading grade. Thus, when we speak of differences of a tenth of a reading grade we are referring to differences of one item correct. For example, a fourth grader who took the Elementary level of the Metropolitan Test in Reading and answered 28 items correctly would have a reading grade equivalent of 4.5. A second fourth grader who took that same test and answered 29 items correctly would have achieved a reading grade equivalent of 4.7.

9) Ethnic Composition, Evaluation of Attendance, Class Size and Cost

At an early planning session of project staff with representatives of the Bureau of Research of the Board of Education, it was decided that it would be valuable to extend for another year the analysis of attendance, class size, ethnic composition of schools, and costs contained in the Bureau's 1966 report of MES. Since these data are routinely collected by the Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics, they were regularly available. Dr. Leonard Moriber of the Bureau not only collected these data, but also wrote a summary on them. This section appears, as he prepared it, in Appendix A.

Bases For Evaluative Conclusions

Any evaluation study must have bases against which to come to evaluative judgments. In this study we used four different bases. In the areas from which we desired rating data from the observers, we compared the distributions of ratings obtained in the ME schools with two other sets of ratings. The first set was that obtained from those schools officially designated as control schools for the evaluation of the MES program. These are the same schools used for comparative purposes in the 1966 evaluation reported by the New York City Board of Education. The second set of data that we used were obtained from the 1966-67 evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program. Since this evaluation was conducted by the same research staff, we deliberately used the same observers, and to the extent they were applicable, the same instruments for rating children's functioning, teacher functioning, and aspects of overall school quality. In this evaluation, then, we used the ratings obtained from the 11 "sending" schools studied for the Free Choice Open Enrollment program. These are special service schools from which children are bussed to other schools in order to promote integration. The sending schools from which data are reported here were randomly selected from all sending schools in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens.[6]

In the areas of achievement in arithmetic and reading we used as bases of comparison the norms for urban schools provided by the publisher, and the conventional standard of dividing the school year into nine testing intervals, from the 15th of September through the 15th of June, with the tenth interval over the summer. Since all tests reported here were given in either the first two weeks of October, March, or April, we used as normal expectation the grade plus one month (for October), six months (for March), or seven months (for April). Achievement was also compared in the matched control and ME schools. Finally, to evaluate the long-term effect of the MES program we used as a base-line the data available from the ME schools before the program began. In a sense, this is matching these schools with themselves as a control. For research purposes, this measure provides the soundest basis for evaluation of change.

Analysis of Data

The nine areas in which instruments were used produced data of different kinds. We shall note here how these data were analyzed and how they will be presented. The observers' ratings of lessons, classes, schools, and teachers all produced objective rating data. These were initially analyzed at a maximum level of specificity to make possible several comparisons. Thus, data were analyzed separately and compared for: 1) whether the class seen was chosen by the principal or by project staff (on the first visit only); 2) the background and experience of the observer, i.e., educator on faculty, educator in independent education, or social scientist; 3) the grade in school; 4) the subject of the lesson; 5) whether the school was an old or a new ME school.

---

[6] There are no sending schools in Richmond, since Open Enrollment does not operate there.

There were no consistent differences between the gradations for any of these variables, therefore, the rating data will be reported for all schools and all grades combined. We noted earlier that for a few items the independent school educators had more positive ratings than either group of faculty members. Similar isolated differences occured, of course, for all of the five comparisons made above. But overall, the data within comparison were so remarkably stable and similar that they were combined for simplicity of reporting and understanding.

The same similarity holds between the levels of achievement in Old and New ME schools in arithmetic and reading. We have, however, reported the data separately so that the new data can be used by any reader wishing to employ them in order to extend data in areas reported in previous evaluations of MES. All previous evaluations which refer to achievement have, as we have done, distinguished the Old from the New ME schools.

The data obtained from the paper and pencil instruments administered to children and to teachers were handled in the same way as the rating data, and the same consistency was found. Therefore, they too are reported for all schools and grades combined.

Finally, the data from the open-end questions on all instruments: observers, interviews, and teacher questionnaire, were subjected to a simple descriptive content analysis and are presented for all schools and grades combined.

In contrast to the similarity of the data by variables such as who chose the class, type of observer, and grade in school, there were sharp differences from school to school within the 20 or 21 ME schools.[7] Therefore, throughout the report an effort will be made to indicate the scope of this variability to the reader.

A final aspect of the data analysis was to test for the statistical significance of the observed differences in the distribution of ratings between ME and control schools, and ME and OE sending schools. This was done by using the chi-square test, at the .05 level of significance.

Presentation of Data

The results of the evaluation are presented in Chapters three through seven. Chapter three presents the data on children's functioning, combining the observers' ratings, the children's perceptions, and the levels of achievement in arithmetic and reading. Chapter four presents the data on teachers' functioning, based on observers' ratings. Chapter five presents the observers' ratings in the area of overall school appraisal. Chapter six presents the data on child and teacher functioning for the study in the early childhood years. Finally, Chapter seven presents the data on staff preceptions of the MES program. In these chapters presenting the results of the study, the basic purpose will be to descriptively present the data. The discussion of the results and conclusions of the study, as seen by the project coordinator, will be presented separately in Chapter eight.

---

[7] In the analysis of data from the middle elementary grades there are twenty schools in the MES program which have such grades. The 21st school goes up to grade two, and is therefore included in the analysis of data on the early childhood grades.

CHAPTER III

CHILDREN'S FUNCTIONING

The basic aim of MES is effective functioning of children. This evaluation estimated pupil functioning in four ways. First, within the ILOR there were five items through which the observers were asked to rate the children's "interest and enthusiasm," "verbal fluency," "participation" in the lesson, "spontaneous questioning," and "volunteering in response to teacher questions." Second, the children's own perceptions of class, school, and self as a learner were obtained through the inventories, _My Class_ and _My School_. Third, academic achievement in arithmetic was estimated from the Metropolitan Achievement Test administered in March 1967, from the Metropolitan Achievement Test used in previous evaluations of MES. Finally, more extensive data were available to estimate achievement in reading. These data were from the Metropolitan Achievement Tests administered during this evaluation in October 1966, April 1967, and June 1967, and also administered twice in each of the preceding two years. These four kinds of data will be discussed in this chapter in the order noted above.

Ratings of Children's In-Class Functioning

Of the five aspects for which the observers rated children's functioning in class, the ratings in ME and control schools were no different on four: verbal fluency, interest and enthusiasm, extent of participation, and frequency of volunteering in response to teacher questions. The one difference occurred in the frequency of spontaneous questioning; the small proportion of times this occurred in ME schools was even smaller in the control schools. Overall, then, the data suggest that in both sets of schools the children exhibited what the observers considered average verbal fluency and better than average interest and enthusiasm. More than half the class participated in the modal lesson, and more than half volunteered a response when the teacher asked a question. In contrast, very few children raised spontaneous questions in the lessons observed. Data for these five aspects are presented individually.

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison	Finding
1) Verbal fluency of children who participated in lesson: There was no statistically significant difference between ME and control schools or between ME and OE sending schools. Source: ILOR	In about 40 per cent of both the ME and control school lessons, the verbal fluency of the children was rated "average"; in about 35 per cent it was rated "below average" or "extremely poor." In only a quarter of the lessons in either ME or control schools was the fluency rated "better than average" or "outstanding."

	Per Cent		
Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
Outstanding	2	1	2
Better than average	20	24	19
Average	42	40	40
Below average	32	30	33
Extremely poor	4	5	6

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison	Finding

2) Children's interest and enthusiasm during lesson:

There was no statistically significant difference between ME and either control or OE sending schools.

Source: ILOR

About half the lessons observed in both the MES and control schools received "better than average" or "outstanding" ratings with the majority of other ratings "average."

	Per Cent		
Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
Outstanding	14	5	11
Better than average	37	39	36
Average	30	36	29
Below average	12	17	18
Extremely poor	7	3	6

3) Overall participation of children in lesson:

There was no statistically significant difference between ME and either conrol or OE sending schools.

Source: ILOR

In three-fourths of the MES lessons and two-thirds of the control lessons observed, "more than half" or "almost all" the class participated; the remaining lessons were about evenly divided between those in which "half the class" participated and those in which "less than half" participated. Only rarely did "few" children participate in a lesson.

	Per Cent		
Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
All, or almost all the class participated.	40	34	32
More than half the class participated	36	33	40
About half the class participated	9	15	13
Less than half the class participated	9	17	8
Few children participated	6	1	7

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

Finding

4) Proportion of children who volunteered in response to teacher questions:

There was no statistically significant difference between ME and control or OE sending schools.

Source: ILOR

In about half the lessons observed in both ME and control schools, "more than half, or "almost all" the children volunteered. Most ratings for the remaining lessons indicate that "about half the children" or "less than half" of the children volunteered. Only occasionally did "very few" children participate.

Scale	MES	Per Cent Control	OE Sending
Almost all the children	18	12	15
More than half	32	31	17
About half the children	20	29	38
Less than half the children	20	13	19
Very few children	10	15	11

5) Number of children who raised spontaneous questions:

There was a statistically significant difference: although in only a few lessons did many children raise spontaneous questions, this did happen more often in ME than in either control or OE sending schools.

In the overwhelming majority of both ME and control school lessons, "less than half" or "very few" children raised spontaneous questions. Nevertheless, this occurred in fewer ME than control lessons, so that in 15 per cent of the MES classes compared with only five per cent of the control lessons, half or more of the children raised spontaneous questions.

Scale	MES	Per Cent Control	OE Sending
Almost every child	1	0	1
More than half	6	1	1
About half	9	4	4
Less than half	17	9	10
Very few children raised spontaneous questions	67	86	84

Children's Perceptions of Class, School, and Self as Learner

As noted in the procedure section of the inventories, My Class or My School was administered to all children in grades four, five, and six of the twenty ME schools with such grades, and in the eight control schools. Table 3 presents the number of children completing each of the inventories, by grade and type of school.

Table 3

Number of Children Completing My Class and My School, by Grade and Type of School

	My Class			My School		
Grade	Old MES	New MES	Control	Old MES	New MES	Control
4	616	486	328	606	481	338
5	545	413	286	540	418	263
6	335	192	131	259	139	144
All Grades	1496	1091	745	1405	1038	745

The inventory, My Class, yields an overall score which reflects the child's perception of his class and classmates. The distribution of such scores is presented in Table 4 for ME schools and for the control schools. As a further basis of evaluation, Table 4 also presents the distribution of scores on this instrument obtained in June 1966, during the evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program. Data are available from that study reflecting the perceptions of children in "sending schools" (i.e., those schools from which children were bussed) and the perceptions of children participating in the Open Enrollment program (i.e., children

Table 4

Distribution of Scores on My Class, by Type of School

Quality of Perception	Score	Per Cent of Children Achieving Indicated Score in: MES	Control	Sending	Open Enrollment
	20-16	2	1	0	0
	15-13	4	3	0	0
	12-9	12	6	7	13
Positive	8-5	18	17	29	35
	4-1	23	24	34	27
Balanced	0	6	8	7	9
	1-4	18	23	18	13
Negative	5-8	12	14	5	3
	9-12	4	3	*	*
	13-15	1	1	0	0
	16-20	*	*	0	0
Total Positive		59	51	70	75
Total Negative		35	41	23	16
Median		+2.1	+0.8	+2.9	+4.2

*There were some children in this category but too few to round to 1 per cent.

who were bussed to other schools). Since there were no consistent differences in the scores achieved by children in old and new ME schools or in the different grades to which My Class was administered, the data in Table 4 are presented for all grades combined in all ME schools.

The scores in ME schools covered the full range of possible scores, with a heavy clustering in both the mild positive (41 per cent) and mild negative (30 per cent) points of view. The median score of 2.1 corroborates this view, for it too reflects that the average child in the ME schools had a slightly positive perception of class and classmates. Overall, 59 per cent of the children in ME schools had positive perceptions. Comparing these data to those of children in the control schools, the MES children had slightly more positive perceptions, since 51 per cent of the children in control schools had positive perceptions and the median score was .8.

However, comparing the data to those collected a year earlier in the 1965-66 evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program, we find the children in ME schools were less likely to have positive perceptions than either the children in sending schools or those being bussed to an open enrollment school. This is true particularly in comparison to the children bussed, 75 per cent of whom had positive perceptions with a median score of 4.2.

Even allowing for the year lapse between the two studies, one would conclude that the MES program has not had any pronounced impact on children's perceptions of class and classmates, as measured by this instrument.

In addition to the overall score, My Class can be analyzed in terms of the response pattern to the individual items. When this was done, no differences were found between Old and New ME schools. The data for the analysis of the items are reported in Table 5 for all ME schools combined. As a further basis for comparison, the data from the 1966 study of Open Enrollment are also included.

A glance down the first two columns of Table 5 indicates that the differences between ME and Control children are usually negligible: the differences are five per cent or less for nine of the 19 items, and are between six per cent and ten per cent for seven more items. The differences exceed ten per cent for only three items, and in all three, larger proportions of children in the ME school held the positive perception. These items involved the fact that MES children were more likely to express a feeling of belonging to the class, to note that the children in class are willing to try something new, and to note that they do have the things needed to do their best work.

Comparing the children in ME and OE sending schools, the differences were even smaller than in the comparison of ME and control schools. For 18 of the 19 items the differences were five per cent or less. In fact, for 12 items the differences were two per cent or less. The one difference beyond the five per cent level was only six per cent. Compared to the children bussed in Open Enrollment, differences were five per cent or less for 11 items, and exceeded ten per cent for three. On all three, the Open Enrollment children were more likely to hold the positive perception; that is, larger proportions of Open Enrollment children believed that everyone in their class had a chance to show what he could do, and that their classmates were polite and not mean.

Table 5

Item Response Patterns for My Class, by Type of School.*

Statement	Type of School MES	Control	OE Send	OE Rec'v
Everyone can do a good job if he tries.	92	93	95	94
Good class, except for one or two children.	85	83	82	82
Do interesting things in class.	77	83	78	82
Can have a good time in class.	74	72	78	74
Not hard to make friends.	71	67	70	71
Children in class happy when you do something for them.	72	64	66	72
Everyone in class has a chance to show what he can do.	64	68	65	74
Don't need better classroom to do best work.	59	62	56	60
Everyone in this class wants to work hard.	52	45	52	61
Feel that they do belong in this class.	51	39	49	48
Everyone is trying to keep classroom nice.	47	40	43	53
Children in class are not pretty mean.	45	38	44	57
Children do want to try new things.	45	33	44	47
Do have things needed to do best work.	43	30	39	40
Everyone in class is polite.	38	31	38	48
A lot of children like to do things together.	34	32	32	38
Not many children in class are unfair.	32	28	30	38
Everyone in class minds his own business.	26	22	25	33
You can trust almost anyone in this class.	23	16	22	31

*Figures cited are percentage giving positive response.

The data in Table 5 also provide an insight into the MES children's perception of their class and classmates which, except for the few differences noted above, characterizes the other children as well. A large majority believe that everyone in their class can do a good job if he tries; that it is a good class except for one or two children; and is one in which they do interesting things. Smaller majorities agree that they can have a good time in the class and make friends easily; that the other children are happy when you do something for them; that everyone has a chance to show what he can do; and that everyone wants to work hard. They do not feel that they need a better classroom to do their best work, and, at the same time, do feel that they belong. However, they do not believe that everyone in class minds his own business, or that you can trust everyone in class. Nor do they believe that everyone is polite. Finally, they believe that many children are unfair. They do not believe that a lot of children like to do things together.[1]

The other inventory used, My School, provides an insight into the children's perceptions of school staff, the school itself, and themselves as learners in general, all within the current school year. These data are presented in Table 6 for the same schools as were used in the analysis of My Class.

Half or more of the children in both ME and control schools held what is considered a positive perception for 16 of the 17 items. The one exception was the belief of children in both groups of schools that the

---

[1] This summary is based on the modal (most frequent) response to each question.

Table 6

Item Response Pattern for My School, by Type of School.*

	Type of School			
Statement	MES	Control	OE Send	OE Rec'v
Teachers want to help.	98	98	96	99
What we are learning is useful.	92	89	91	91
Teachers explain clearly.	90	90	89	91
Teachers are really interested in me.	86	80	82	85
Learned more this year than before.	78	78	78	81
Principal is friendly.	78	72	78	76
Trip to school isn't too long.	78	68	80	66
Work isn't too hard.	77	67	78	78
School building is pleasant.	67	68	60	72
Teachers are fair and square.	67	66	65	74
Don't wish didn't go to school.	67	60	69	65
Work not too easy.	63	62	61	69
Good lunches.	54	70	44	46
If work hard, get somewhere.	56	48	54	51
Best school I know.	48	49	36	54
Teachers expect you to work too hard.	46	66	56	45
Boys and girls don't fight too much.	19	14	14	32

*Figures cited are percentage giving positive response.

"boys and girls fight too much," a belief voiced by 79 per cent of the ME children and 84 per cent of the control children. Differences between ME and control schools were less than ten per cent for 13 of the 17 items. For three of the four larger differences, the quality of the response was the same. These four differences reflected a larger proportion of ME than control children denying that the trip to school was too long, or that the work was too hard. In contrast, a larger proportion of control than MES children liked the school lunch, and noted that the teacher expects them to work too hard. This last item might be considered a negative response, but in a period when concern is voiced about teacher expectation, and the suggestion that it affects functioning makes the front page of the New York Times,[2] we judged it positive.

For My School, just as for My Class, differences between ME and sending school children were smaller than between ME and control school children. For 14 of the 17 items they were less than ten per cent, and in fact, for 11 they were two percent or less. The largest differences reflected more ME than sending school children liking the lunches, and believing the school they attended was the best school they knew, but fewer ME than sending school children believing that the teachers expected them to work too hard.

Comparing ME and OE children, differences were consistently smaller on My School than they had been on My Class. Only two differences exceeded ten per cent, and nine were two per cent or less. The two largest differences involved the larger majority of MES children who denied that the trip to school was too long and the larger proportion (not a majority in either instance) of OE children who denied that the children in their class fight too much.

---

[2] John Leo, "Study Indicates Pupils Do Well When Teacher is Told They Will," New York Times, August 8, 1967, p. 1.

The profile of the MES school which comes through these data (in view of the small differences involved) is a profile of the other types of schools as well. It is of a school in which almost all the children believe that what they are learning is useful, that their teachers are really interested, want to help, and want to explain things clearly. A large majority see it as a school in which the principal is friendly; the work is not too hard and the trip is not too long, and where they felt (in May) that they learned more this year than last, but in which the boys and girls fight too much. Smaller majorities noted their belief that the school building was pleasant, the teachers fair, that they had no wishes not to go to school, and while they didn't think the work too hard, they didn't believe it was too easy either. About half said that the lunches were good, that if they worked hard they did get somewhere, that the teachers expected you to work too hard, and that the school they were attending was the best school they knew.

Achievement in Arithmetic

Data to estimate achievement in arithmetic are available from two sources. First, the children's current status can be estimated from data made available to the project from the citywide testing in arithmetic during early March 1967. These data can then be used to extend the longitudinal study reported in the 1966 evaluation of MES by the Board of Education.

Current Status of Achievement in Arithmetic

Table 7 reports the current achievement levels of the children as of the administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts in March of 1967. Differences between Old and New ME schools were negligible, and so we shall discuss only the columns headed "All." These data indicate that the children tested in grades two and three were functioning at normal levels, with the second graders .2 of a year above the norm, and the third graders .1 below. However, by fourth grade the children were .6 of a grade behind. This increased to .8 by fifth grade and to a year by sixth grade. The final rows of Table 7 show that variability from school to school was large, for within these twenty schools, the school with the highest median was at least one year, and as much as 1.9 years, higher than the school with the lowest median.

Table 7

Grade Equivalents in Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts Test, Medians, Status in Relation to Norms and Range; by Grade and Type of School.

Statistic	Grade 2			3			4			5			6		
	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All
Mean	2.8	2.7	2.8	3.4	3.5	3.5	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.8	5.4	5.6
Norm	2.6	2.6	2.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	6.6	6.6	6.6
Status in Relation to Norm	+.2	+.1	+.2	-.2	-.1	-.1	-.3	-.7	-.6	-.8	-.8	-.8	-.8	-1.2	-1.0
Lowest School Median	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	5.0	5.1	5.0
Highest School Median	3.4	3.3	3.4	4.4	3.9	4.4	5.4	4.3	5.4	5.6	5.3	5.6	6.5	5.9	6.5
Overall Range by School	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.6	1.1	1.6	1.9	.8	1.9	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.5	.8	1.5

The longitudinal effect of the MES program on arithmetic achievement is indicated in Table 8. These data extend the results of the two year study previously reported by the Board of Education[3] through the third year of MES. Thus the data in Table 8 are based on the children in those schools who had the three full years of MES in the Old ME schools, or two years in the New ME schools. Considering the Old ME schools, two comparisons are available; first from those who were first tested as they began grade three and who were tested finally towards the end of grade five; and the second comparison for children initially tested at the beginning of grade four and finally tested towards the end of grade six. In both instances the two-year follow-up had shown that the children had decreased the extent of their retardation. However, the three year follow-up shows that in the first instance the children slipped back, and in the second, made no further advance. Thus the children initially tested at the beginning of the third grade when they were .5 of a year behind the norm were .7 of a year behind when tested towards the end of grade five. Those initially tested as they began grade four were 1.1 years behind compared to their retardation of .7 of a year when they were tested towards the end of grade six. All of this gain had, however, been achieved during the previous year.

The two comparisons for the New ME schools reported in Table 8 are inconsistent. In the first, we see a pattern of initial favorable impact which is not maintained, whereas in the second we see no impact at all.

---

[3] Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program Summary Report, Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, September 1966.

Table 8

Longitudinal Study in Arithmetic Achievement, Old and New MES

Grade	Date of Test	No. of Children	Median	Norm at Testing	Comparison with Norm	Net Change		
						by May '66	During '66-'67	by Mar. '67
Old MES								
3	Oct. '64	628	2.6	3.1	-.5	+.2	-.4	-.2
4	May '66	628	4.5	4.8	-.3			
5	Mar. '67	531	4.9	5.6	-.7			
4	Oct. '64	656	3.0	4.1	-1.1	+.4	0	+.4
5	May '66	656	5.1	5.8	-.7			
6	Mar. '67	408[a]	5.9	6.6	-.7			
New MES								
4	Oct. '65	741	3.1	4.2	-1.1	+.5	0	+.5
4	May '66	741	4.2	4.8	-.6			
5	Mar. '67	383	5.0	5.6	-.6			
5	Oct. '65	694	4.0	5.2	-1.2	-.1	+.1	0
5	May '66	694	4.5	5.8	-1.3			
6	Mar. '67	102[a]	5.4	6.6	-1.2			

[a] The Attrition here reflects the fact that few ME schools have a sixth grade.

Thus, children in the New ME schools initially tested as they began grade four were 1.1 years below the norm.[4] They improved their status .5 of a grade during their first year in MES but made no further improvement during the second year. In contrast, the children initially tested when they began grade five basically did not change during their two years in MES. Towards the end of grade six, they were 1.2 years behind the norm, the same retardation with which they had begun grade five.

Overall, one would conclude that the MES program has not had any significant or consistent effect on the children's performance in arithmetic problem solving and concepts. Specifically, the 1966-67 school year was particularly unproductive. During 1966-67, in two instances there was no change in relation to the norm, in one an advance of .1 of a year, and in the fourth, a loss of .4 of a year, as can be seen in the next to the last column of Table 8.

Achievement in Reading

Data to estimate achievement in reading are available from three sources. First, as noted in the procedure chapter, copies of the results of the citywide reading tests administered in ME and control schools in October 1966 and April 1967, were sent to the project office. Secondly, data on previous years' testing were available from the previous evaluations of MES. Finally, for a sample of classes, project staff administered an alternate form of the Metropolitan Reading Test in June 1967. These several sets of data make possible a wide variety of analyses of the children's achievement in reading. We shall begin with the data on current status, based on the citywide testing done in April 1967.

---

[4] This norm is the second month of the school year since the children were tested after October 15.

Current Status of Achievement in Reading

Table 9 presents, by grade, the medians, interquartile ranges, and the overall ranges for the Old and New ME schools, and for all ME schools combined. The final row of Table 9 presents the normal level of expectation for the test given in the first two weeks of April of a school year. The norms used for determining these grade equivalents were the urban norms referred to earlier, and so the grade equivalents reported are .1 or .2 of a grade higher than if national norm tables had been used.[5]

There were no differences between the Old and New ME schools. In most instances the medians and quartiles were identical and never were they more than .1 of a grade apart. Thus, the fact that some schools had the MES program for three years and others for only two was not reflected in differences in reading levels achieved by the children in April 1967. In view of this lack of difference, the discussion below will be based on the data for all schools combined.

As can be seen by reference to the row headed "status in reference to the norm," on the average there was retardation in all grades, and generally increasing retardation at higher grades. Thus, second graders were almost at grade level with a negligible average retardation of .1 of a grade. By third grade this had increased to .3, and by fourth grade to .8. At the upper elementary grades, the retardation exceeded a year: 1.1 in grade five, and 1.2 for those schools with grade six.

Table 9 also reflects the extent of the variability in performance, both among children and between schools. Using a composite distribution,[6] we identified the first quartile (that point below which 25 per cent of the group has scored) and the third quartile (that point below which 75 per cent of the group has scored). In between these points lie the middle

---

[5] These two sets of norms are discussed in the procedure chapter.

[6] Created by combining the separate distributions for each school.

Table 9

Grade Equivalents in Reading, April 1967, by Grade, Type of School, Medians, Quartiles, Interquartile Ranges and Overall Ranges.

Statistic	Grade: 2			3			4			5			6		
	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All
Median	2.6	2.6	2.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.5	4.6	4.6	5.5	5.5	5.5
Norm for date	2.7	2.7	2.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	6.7	6.7	6.7
Status in Relation to Norm	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.2	-.3	-.3	-.8	-.7	-.8	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.2	-1.2	-1.2
Third Quartile	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.7	4.8	4.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	7.4	7.2	7.3
First Quartile	2.2	2.2	2.2	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.4	4.5	4.4
Interquartile Range	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.9	1.8	1.9	3.0	2.7	2.9
Lowest School Median	2.3	2.2	2.2	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.6	3.3	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.7	4.9	4.7
Highest School Median	2.9	3.2	3.2	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.9	4.5	4.9	5.8	5.2	5.8	6.6	5.7	6.6
Overall Range by School	.6	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.9	1.9	1.7	.8	1.7	1.9	.8	1.2

50 per cent of the children and the range covered by this middle 50 per cent is indicated in the row headed "interquartile range." Thus, in the second grade, the middle 50 per cent of the children covered a range of 1.1 reading grades, i.e., were a bit more than one year apart in reading level. In the third and fourth grades, the ranges were only slightly higher: 1.3 and 1.4 years. But in fifth and sixth grades, the ranges increased sharply, to 1.9 years in grade five and to 2.9 years in grade six.[7] Another way of noting the large variability is to compare school medians. This is done in the last section of Table 9. In this section, the lowest and highest school medians are indicated, as are the differences between them, i.e., the overall range between schools. This range is never less than one year, and is typically between one and one-half and two years. Thus, these data on variability make clear that for reading achievement, as for the data previously reported, the variability from school to school was so great as to lead to the conclusion that no consistent effect was achieved by the MES program.

Gains Achieved During the 1966-67 School Year

A second way of considering these reading data is to compare the data from April 1967 with those made available by the Board of Education from the testing in October 1966. This comparison provides an estimate of the gains achieved during the 1966-1967 school year. These data are reported in Table 10.

The period from October to April involves six months of the school year, and so normal gains in that period would be .6. With the exception of the sixth grade in the Old ME schools, all grades in both Old and New

---

[7] The dramatic increase in grade six reflects the atypically high performance of two schools, where children were reading at or above grade level in all grades. Although these schools affect the data in all grades, they have their maximum effect in grade six since there were only 12 schools with a sixth grade.

Table 10

Median Reading Grade Equivalents October 1966 and April 1967, and Gains During 1966-67 School Year, Old and New MES and Control Schools, by Grade

Grade	Type of School	Median Reading Grade October 1966	 April 1967	 Gain
2	Old MES	1.8	2.6	.8
	New MES	1.8	2.6	.8
	All MES	1.8	2.6	.8
	All Control	1.7	2.3	.6
3	Old MES	2.5	3.5	1.0
	New MES	2.4	3.4	1.0
	All MES	2.4	3.4	1.0
	All Control	2.4	3.2	.8
4	Old MES	3.3	3.9	.6
	New MES	3.2	4.0	.8
	All MES	3.3	3.9	.6
	All Control	3.2	3.7	.5
5	Old MES	3.8	4.5	.7
	New MES	3.7	4.6	.9
	All MES	3.7	4.6	.9
	All Control	3.8	4.3	.5
6	Old MES	5.1	5.5	.4
	New MES	4.6	5.5	.9
	All MES	4.9	5.5	.6
	All Control	5.0	5.5	.5

ME schools achieved normal progress, and in grades two, three, and five the gains were between .1 and .4 beyond normal progress. In comparison, the control schools showed relatively normal gains in grades two and three (.2 above normal), but just under normal gains in grades four, five, and six.

Thus, these data suggest that the 1966-67 period was one in which the children in ME schools progressed normally in reading and did somewhat better than the children in the control schools. A more thorough comparison with the control schools which is presented below, strengthens this interpretation.

Comparison of Achievement Levels and Gains in ME and Control Schools

In addition to comparing the levels achieved in ME schools to those expected for the grade on the urban norms, another way of estimating the progress in ME schools is to compare each ME school with its control counterpart. These data are presented in Table 11 which presents separately, for each grade for which complete data are available, the median reading grade equivalent achieved in each school in October 1966, and in April 1967. The difference between these medians is also entered in the columns headed "Gain." At the bottom of Table 11 appears a summary of the comparison within each pair. Thus, this last section indicated that within grade two, comparing the eight pairs of medians from the October testing, the ME school in the pair had a higher median four times, the control school never had a higher median, and in four cases there was no difference.

These data indicate that in slightly more than half of the comparisons (18 out of 32) the children in the ME school began the year at a higher level of reading achievement. In six comparisons the control school children were reading better, and in eight comparisons there was no difference. In April, the children in the ME school were reading at

Table 11

Comparison of Gains in Median Grade Equivalents in ME and Control Schools by Grade, October 1966 to April 1967.

		Grade											
		2			3			4			5		
Pair	School Type	Oct.	April	Gain	Oct.	April	Gain	Oct.	April	Gain	Oct.	April	Gain
A	MES	1.7	2.4	.7	2.7	3.5	.8	3.4	4.0	.6	3.7	4.1	.4
	C	1.7	2.4	.7	2.4	3.1	.7	3.3	3.7	.4	3.4	3.9	.5
B	MES	2.3	2.9	.6	2.8	3.6	.8	3.9	4.9	1.0	5.0	5.8	.8
	C	1.8	2.5	.7	2.6	3.7	1.1	3.6	4.4	.8	4.6	5.1	.5
C	MES	1.7	2.3	.6	2.3	3.2	.9	3.1	3.3	.2	3.5	4.4	.9
	C	1.7	2.2	.5	2.3	3.0	.7	2.8	3.3	.5	3.4	4.0	.6
D	MES	1.7	2.6	.9	2.4	3.3	.9	3.2	3.8	.6	3.7	4.5	.8
	C	1.7	2.4	.7	2.3	3.1	.8	3.2	3.6	.4	4.0	4.1	.1
E	MES	1.9	2.8	.9	2.9	3.6	.7	3.3	4.2	.9	4.0	4.9	.9
	C	1.9	2.8	.9	2.4	3.5	1.1	3.6	4.2	.6	4.2	4.7	.5
F	MES	1.8	3.2	1.4	2.3	4.3	2.0	3.1	3.8	.7	3.5	4.9	1.4
	C	1.6	2.3	.7	2.4	3.2	.8	3.2	3.8	.6	3.5	4.3	.8
G	MES	1.6	2.3	.7	2.1	3.0	.9	3.1	3.9	.8	4.2	4.4	.2
	C	1.5	2.1	.6	2.2	3.0	.8	3.0	3.3	.3	3.3	4.0	.7
H	MES	2.0	2.8	.8	2.6	3.4	.8	3.7	4.3	.6	4.0	4.6	.6
	C	1.7	2.4	.7	2.5	3.3	.8	3.1	3.7	.6	4.0	4.5	.5
All Pairs	Mean Diff.	.14	.38	.15	.12	.25	.12	.12	.28	.15	.15	.38	.25
No. of times ME School higher		4	6	5	5	6	5	5	5	6	4	8	6
No. of times Control School higher		0	0	1	2	1	2	2	0	1	2	0	2
No. of times no difference		4	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	0	0

a higher level of achievement in 25 of the 32 comparisons, with the control school children higher only once. This change was based on the fact that the children in ME schools showed larger gains from October to April in 22 of the 32 comparisons. The magnitude of these differential gains, however, was small: .12 of a year in grade three, .15 of a year in grades two and four, and .25 of a year in grade five.

The Paradox of Normal Progress With Increasing Retardation

The data presented in Tables 9, and 10, seem to combine to produce the paradox of children gaining normally or better and simultaneously falling further and further behind normal levels, which is clearly impossible. An understanding of this apparent paradox is provided by considering the other 4 months of school year, i.e., the period after the spring testing and before the fall testing. Table 12 presents the data looked at in this way. This table has been constructed for the old ME schools, by taking the median grade equivalents reported in October 1964, when the program first began, and using these as a baseline for following progress in these schools across the three years. In the first section of Table 12 appear the data for the second grade in October 1964, and May 1965, followed by the data reported for the third grade in October 1965, and May 1966, and for the fourth grade in October 1966, and April 1967. The second section of the table reports the same data collections for grades three, four and five, and then for grades four, five and six.[8]

Then, for each of these three year periods Table 12 presents separately the changes from fall to spring and from spring to fall of the following grade. Comparing these two periods indicates a striking discrepancy. In these three sets of data there are nine comparisons reported from fall to spring. In six of these the ME schools improved

---

[8] It is important to note that these are not all the same children for each of the three years, since some children transferred out of these schools and others transferred into them. This factor will be considered in the next analysis of the data.

Table 12

Changes in Reading Level, Fall to Spring and Spring to Fall, MES, October 1964 to April 1967

Grades	Statistic	Year 1 Oct. '64	Year 1 May '65	Year 2 Oct. '65	Year 2 May '66	Year 3 Oct. '66	Year 3 April '67	All Three Years
2,3,4	Median	1.8	2.4	2.6	3.7	3.3	3.9	
	Fall to Spring Change	+.6		+1.1		+.6		
	Expected Change	+.7		+.7		+.6		+.3
	Net Change	-.1		+.4		0		
	Spring to Fall Change		+.2		-0.4			
	Expected Change		+.3		+.3			-.8
	Net Change		-.1		-0.7			
3,4,5	Median	2.6	3.4	3.4	4.2	3.8	4.5	
	Fall to Spring Change	+.8		+.8		+.7		
	Expected Change	+.7		+.7		+.6		+.3
	Net Change	+.1		+.1		+.1		
	Spring to Fall Change		0		-.4			
	Expected Change		+.3		+.3			-1.0
	Net Change		-.3		-.7			
4,5,6	Median	3.0	4.1	4.4	5.2	5.1	5.5	
	Fall to Spring Change	1.1		+.8		+.4		
	Expected Change	.7		+.7		+.6		+.3
	Net Change	+.4		+.1		-.2		
	Spring to Fall Change		+.3		-.1			
	Expected Change		+.3		+.3			-.4
	Net Change		0		-.4			

their status in relation to the norms, and in one other they made normal progress. In only two instances did they lose ground. In contrast, of the six possible comparisons from spring to fall, the ME schools never improved their status, held their own only once, and lost ground five times. Moreover the data in the next to last column show that over the three-year period, from fall to spring the children gained .3 of a year beyond the norms. In contrast, from spring to fall they lost .8, 1.0, and .4 of a year. In all then, this results in an average gain over normal progress of .1 of a year from fall to spring, followed by an average loss of .7 of a year from spring to fall, made up of a decline of .4 and the unrealized gain of .3 of a year.

A comparative analysis of the data for the control schools for the period from April 1966, to October 1966, indicates that children in these schools did not gain as expected either. However, in contrast to the children in the ME schools, on the average, grades in the control schools either maintained their April median, or gained .1 of a year by October.

Put into practical terms, these data mean that a teacher in any one upper elementary grade in an ME school must spend at least the first few months, and in some instances more, simply making up the losses which occurred and the gains which did not, since the spring testing. Thus, while her children show a gain from October to April which seems normal, much of this was simply catching up for what happened to them since the preceding spring. Seen in this way, the data make clear why children seem to be gaining normally when looked at from the beginning to the end of each academic year, yet overall are falling further behind as they progress through school.

This analysis suggests two others as fruitful for estimating the effect of MES on reading levels. One is to compare the school reading profiles each October and each April for the three years of the program. This has been done in Table 13. The second is to isolate the children who, as individuals, have had three full years of education in an ME school and see what their current status is.[9] These data are presented in Table 14.

Change Across Three Years of MES

Considering Table 13, these data show no consistent effect of MES on the profiles in reading achievement, for the three October studies. The April data suggest that effects achieved in the first year of operation of MES have not been maintained successfully. Consider the October data for Old ME schools. In October of 1964, before MES existed, the median reading grade in the second grade was 1.8. Two years later, although MES had now been in effect for two years, and had concentrated on the early years, the children beginning grade two had the same median reading grade of 1.8. In grades three and five the median had actually declined although most of the children tested in October of 1966 had now had two years of MES. The only evidence of positive change appears in grade four, with an increade of .3, and grade six with an increase of .2. But the overall pattern of two grades declining, two increasing

---

[9] A third fruitful analysis would have been to study the changes in these individual children across the spring-fall-spring periods. This was one of the analyses planned for the summer of 1967 which had to be abandoned because of the fact that the use of Cumulative Record cards was not possible.

Table 13

Profiles of Median School Achievement in Reading Across Three Years of MES, by Grade, Type of School, Fall and Spring

Grade	Type of School	Oct. '64	Oct. '65	Oct. '66	May '65	May '66	April '67	Projected May '67
2	Old MES	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.4	2.8	2.6	2.7
	New MES	X	1.6	1.8	X	2.4	2.6	2.7
3	Old MES	2.6	2.6	2.5	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.6
	New MES	X	2.4	2.4	X	3.4	3.4	3.5
4	Old MES	3.0	3.4	3.3	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.0
	New MES	X	3.2	3.2	X	3.7	4.0	4.1
5	Old MES	4.0	4.4	3.8	5.1	5.2	4.5	4.6
	New MES	X	4.1	3.7	X	4.5	4.6	4.7
6	Old MES	4.9	5.1	5.1	6.1	6.1	5.5	5.6
	New MES	X	4.6	4.6	X	5.3	5.5	5.6

Table 14

Longitudinal Analysis of Progress in Reading,
MES, October 1964 through April 1967,
Median Reading Grade

Grade	Number	Date of Test	Median Grade	Norm at Testing	Comparison with Norm	NET Change		
						by 5/66	During '66-'67	by 4/67
2	784	Oct. '64	1.8	2.1	-.3			
3	784	May '66	3.7	3.8	-.1	+.2	-.6	-.4
4	744	Apr. '67	4.0	4.7	-.7			
3	759	Oct. '64	2.7	3.1	-.4			
4	759	May '66	4.2	4.8	-.6	-.2	-.3	-.5
5	697	Apr. '67	4.8	5.7	-.9			
4	567	Oct. '64	3.2	4.1	-.9			
5	567	May '66	5.2	5.8	-.6	+.3	-.3	0
6	395	Apr. '67	5.8	6.7	-.9			

and one not changing, clearly leads to the conclusion of no consistent effect.

The initial data from the New ME schools completely corroborates this conclusion. In October 1965, MES had just begun in these schools. In October 1966, it had functioned for one year. Yet the median grade equivalents in grades three, four, and six were unchanged, and although grade two, in 1966 was .2 higher than its predecessor, grade five was .4 lower. Again, there was no consistent effect.

The April data suggest a Hawthorne effect in the first year of two of MES, which is not maintained for the third year. Comparing May '65 with May '66 in the Old ME schools, one notes gains in every grade other than grade six, where there was no change. Similarly in the New ME schools, comparing May '66 with April 1967, one notes gains in every grade. However, in the third year of the MES program, by comparing May '66 to April '67, for the Old ME schools, one notes a decline in every grade! While this decline is relatively small in the middle elementary grades, it is .7 of a year in grade five and .6 of a year in grade six. Clearly the performance levels suggested by the testing program in May 1966, were not repeated in April 1967.

This decline in the third year of MES is further shown when the data are examined for children who have had three years of MES education. To do this, Table 14 takes a longitudinal two-year analysis presented in the 1966 evaluation of MES by the Bureau of Research of the Board of Education [10] and extends it a third year. Children included in this analysis are only those who have been in one of the Old ME schools for the full three years of the program.[11]

---

[10] Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program Summary Report, New York City Board of Education, September 1966, p. 34.

In October of 1964, second grade children in the Old ME schools were reading at 1.8, three-tenths of a year below normal. Two years later, those who had had the full two years of MES were tested at the end of grade three and were reported to be reading at 3.7, only one-tenth of a year below normal. Thus Table 14 indicates that by May 1966, these children had improved .2 in relationship to the norm. However, the April 1967 data for these same children indicates that in the fourth grade they were reading at 4.0, seven-tenths of a year below the norm. Even more serious, these data indicate an overall lose during three years of MES of four-tenths of a year.

A similar picture exists for the children initially tested in October 1964, as they began grade three. At that point they were .4 of a year below normal. The Bureau of Research reported that by May 1966, they had fallen further behind, and the April 1967 data shows that in grade five they were now .9 of a year behind. This is a net loss in their position relative to the norm of .5, or half a year during their three years of MES. The picture is somewhat different for the children initially tested in grade four. They began the MES program .9 of a year behind, and by May 1966, had reduced this to .6 of a year. As of April 1967, they had slipped back again, and once more were .9 of a year behind.

---

[11] Some children counted in the Bureau's two-year study were not included in the three-year study because they had transferred or were absent. Transfers were particularly high in grade six since few ME schools include that grade.

The three years of MES, therefore, had no effect on their retardation.

Overall, these data indicate that three full years of MES did not have any effect in stopping the increasing retardation of children who began the program in grades two or three, but did have some initial effect, albeit not maintained, on the retardation of the children who began the program in grade four.

Comparison of Levels, April and June 1967

The two sets of data in the immediately previous discussions combine to indicate an almost double Hawthorne effect. That is they suggest that in its initial year or two MES has a positive effect on reading levels, as tested, but that this effect was not maintained over a third year. This effect seems to be selectively expressed only in the spring testing sessions, and not in the October sessions. This is where we suggest a double Hawthorne effect; that within the school year efforts may be oriented towards the goal of the spring testing, with both teachers and pupils seeing this as the culminating academic experience of the school year. The post-test letdown then is expressed in the October testing.

Data available from the citywide testing did not enable us to determine if the decline occurred completely during the summer, or if it reflected an artificial spring peak. Therefore, as noted in the procedure chapter, we decided to test these alternative possibilities by re-testing a sample of children in June of 1967 with an alternate form of the Metropolitan Reading Test. For this testing session, project staff administered and scored the tests. We tested at least one class at each grade between grades two and six in all twenty ME schools with such grades. In all, we tested 218 classes. Table 15 presents data

Table 15

Comparison of April and June Test Results, by Class and Grade, MES

		Number of Classes Which:			Percent of Classes Which:	
Grade	Number of Classes Tested	Increased	Did Not Change	Declined	Did Not Change	Declined
2	53	26	7	20	13	38
3	51	21	9	21	18	41
4	43	22	8	13	19	30
5	42	25	3	14	7	33
6	29	17	3	9	10	31

showing the number of classes at each grade which increased from April to June, the number which stayed the same, and the number which declined. These data indicate that the spring-fall decline sets in before the summer. Although we were testing two months later in the school year than the April testing, between 40 per cent and 59 per cent of the classes we tested at each grade either showed no progress or declined. The proportion of classes which actually declined varied from 30 per cent in grade four to 41 per cent in grade three.

In addition to pinpointing when the spring-fall decline begins, a consideration of the June data also indicates that the stability of the April test results varied tremendously from school to school. Extremely stable data are indicated in the three schools in which all classes tested increased from April to June, as expected. Similar stability is indicated in the seven schools where no more than a few classes, never more that 30 per cent of those tested, declined. At the opposite extreme is the instability reflected in the school in which all of the 13 classes tested declined, with the declines in class averages being a year or more in seven of the 13 classes, up to a maximum decline of 1.8 years. In between are the other 16 schools in which the proportion of classes tested actually declining varied from 5 per cent to 80 per cent. The basic stability for many of the schools indicates that the presence of a stranger coming in to administer a reading test was not, in itself, a factor sufficient to distort the class average performance. Nor can the consistent and large declines in some few schools be explained by the "Hawthorning" suggestion noted earlier. Instead, one must consider the possibility that the April data reported for these few schools was inflated by some consistent factor. This experience suggests that in critical evaluations of programs, there is considerable merit in testing by outside agencies to avoid any possibility of contamination.

The Effect of Mobility on Reading Level

In an effort to understand the lack of effect of MES on reading a further analysis was done of the data from the Old ME schools to distinguish three groups of children: 1) those who had both full MES and consecutive education, i.e., they had been in the ME school not only for the entire time it was an ME school, but also who had never attended any other school; 2) those who had full MES but broken education, i.e., they had transferred into the ME school before MES began and so had full MES but had attended more than one school; and 3) those who had neither full MES nor consecutive education, since they had transferred into the ME school after the MES program began. Table 16 presents the data for these three groups of students, now in grades four, five, and six.

The data are completely consistent in all three grades: those with consecutive education and full MES did best, those with full MES but broken education come next, and those with broken education and less than the full three years of MES came last. The data indicate that not only did the full three years in MES make a difference, but also whether or not the child had continuous education. These data reinforce one of the recommendations made in the original proposal for MES, that efforts "be made to overcome the effects of pupil and family mobility...."[12]

---

[12] Report of the Joint Planning Committee, May 15, 1964, p. ii.

Table 16

Comparison of Reading Levels for Children with Different Educational Histories by Grade, Old ME Schools Only.

Current Grade	Gp.	Education	MES	Median	Q3	Q1	IQR	Norm
4	1	Unbroken	Full	4.1	4.9	3.4	1.5	
	2	Broken	Full	3.9	4.6	3.2	1.4	4.7
	3	Broken	Partial	3.6	4.3	3.1	1.2	
5	1	Unbroken	Full	4.9	6.0	4.1	1.9	
	2	Broken	Full	4.7	5.7	3.9	1.8	5.7
	3	Broken	Partial	4.4	5.4	3.7	1.7	
6	1	Unbroken	Full	5.9	8.7	4.8	3.9	
	2	Broken	Full	5.6	7.3	4.4	2.9	6.7
	3	Broken	Partial	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	

Of course the data also indicate that the groups with both continuous education in one school and three full years of MES were still .6 of a year behind the urban norms in grade four; .8 behind in grade five and .8 behind in grade six.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF TEACHER FUNCTIONING

Evaluations of teacher functioning are available from two different instruments completed by the observers, the ILOR and the Teacher Behavior Record. We shall consider the data derived from the ILOR first.

Ratings of the Teaching Process

On the ILOR, 13 items provide a basis for evaluating the teaching process. We asked the observers to make three overall judgments of the lesson they saw, rating its overall quality, its depth, and the amount of material covered. They reported, on the average, that the lessons in MES were above average both in quality and the amount of material covered, and of better quality than the lessons seen in the control schools. In depth, the typical lesson was rated as average in both ME and control schools. We then asked for ratings of the planning and organization evidence in the lesson, the creativity and imagination evidenced, and the extent and effectiveness of the use of teaching aids. The observers believed that the typical MES lessons showed above average or exceptional organization and planning, average creativity and imagination, and some effective use of aids. For both planning and the use of aids, the ratings were more positive in ME than in control schools. We then turned to the question of continuity in teaching, asking the observers to rate four items: the extent to which the lesson 1) referred to earlier material, 2) established a foundation for future lessons, 3) established a foundation for the child's independent work, and 4) the extent to which it built upon the child's background and experience. For each of these four aspects the observers reported seeing "some", but not "considerable" opportunity for continuity in MES lessons. Except for references to the child's own experience, they found similar opportunities for continuity in the lessons in the control schools. The MES ratings were, therefore, significantly more positive (or less negative!) for one out of the four aspects related to continuity. The final item, for which observers were asked to rate both ME and control school lessons, involved the discipline and control achieved. Typically, it was rated as good or excellent in MES lessons, and the proportion of positive ratings was higher than in the control schools.

Overall then, of the 11 aspects related to teacher functioning for which comparative data are available, five of the ratings were significantly more positive in ME than in control schools. Thus, the overall conclusion is that the observers felt the teaching process was somewhat better in the ME schools.

In addition to the 11 comparison items, the observers were asked to rate the teacher's utilization of the small class size in the MES lesson. The majority noted that they saw little adaptation in the lesson, and corroborated this by reporting their judgment that the same lesson could have been taught to larger classes with no loss of effectiveness. Thus, one of the basic criticisms noted in the 1966 evaluation of MES conducted by the Center for Urban Education, was that "In too many classes lessons were being conducted as if forty children were present."[1] One year later, after even more extensive observation of what was happening in classes, a new team of observers made the same criticism. This is one clear clue to the lack of overt evidence of improved functioning by the children. This basic administrative restructuring of class size and teacher-pupil ratio has not resulted in an equally radical restructuring of the methods of instruction, and so observers see extant lessons as those which could just as easily be taught to larger classes.

---

[1] The More Effective Schools Program, Center For Urban Education, p.7.

Below, the specific data for each of these aspects are presented, in the same double column format used for the aspects on children's functioning.

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison	Finding
1) Quality of instruction: There was a statistically significant difference: Quality was rated higher in MES than in control schools. Source: ILOR	In MES, the quality of instruction was rated "above average" in almost half of the lessons observed, compared to one-third in the control schools. Since the same one-fifth of the lessons was rated below average in each type of school, control school lessons were more likely to be rated "average" than were MES lessons.

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Outstanding	14	6	8
Better than average	32	26	37
Average	34	52	27
Below average	14	10	17
Extremely poor	6	6	11

What accounted for quality of instruction rating in MES?	Observers were also given the opportunity to explain the basis for their rating of the quality of instruction. Those who rated it as average noted soundness of planning, preparation, structure, the attention paid to individual children, and the teacher-pupil relationship. Less often they noted aspects such as the use of media, and leading children to think and use ideas. Those who considered it average noted that they saw no differences between MES and other special service schools they knew. Specifically,

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

Finding

they commented that they saw traditional or conventional teaching, which they considered competent but not inspired or creative, and as not taking advantage of the opportunities offered by the MES program.

Those who rated quality below average or very poor pointed to what they considered dull, rote and repetitious lessons, with an emphasis on the teacher feeding information to children. They noted a lack of creativity and, like those who rated quality as average, commented on the lack of utilization of the possibilities in the MES program.

2) Amount of material covered:

There was no statistically significant difference between ME and control lessons, or between ME and OE sending school lessons

Source: ILOR

A rating of "outstanding" or "above average" was given to 40 per cent of the lessons observed in the MES schools, as compared to 28 per cent in the control schools. About 45 per cent were "average" in both sets of schools, but only 16 per cent were considered "below average" in MES compared to 25 per cent in control schools.

	Per Cent		
Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
Outstanding	10	3	5
Better than average	30	25	26
Average	44	47	43
Below average	10	20	20
Extremely poor	6	5	6

3) Depth of lesson:

There was no statistically significant difference between ME, control and OE sending school lessons

Source: ILOR

Approximately one-third of the lessons received a rating of "outstanding" or "above average" in both cases, with another 40 per cent rated as average. But 31 per cent of control lessons were rated "below average" compared to 22 per cent of MES lessons.

		Per Cent	
Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
Outstanding	11	3	6
Better than average	27	28	25
Average	40	38	38

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

Finding

Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
Below average	16	26	20
Extremely poor	6	5	11

4) Overall planning and organization:

There was a statistically significant difference in pattern: A higher proportion of lessons were rated as showing signs of exceptional organization in ME schools than in control schools. However, there was no statistically significant difference in planning and organization between ME and OE sending schools.

Source: ILOR

Approximately half of the lessons in both sets of schools were rated as "average" in organization. But 20 per cent of ME lessons were rated as "exceptionally well organized" compared to 7 per cent of the lessons in control schools. Both sets of schools had an equally small percentage of lessons rated as having "little organization," but about 40 per cent of the lessons observed in the control, compared to 20 per cent in MES schools, were rated as showing only "some" sign of planning and organization.

	Per Cent		
Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
Exceptional organization	20	7	12
Average organization	51	46	44
Some organization	20	39	40
Little organization	9	8	4

5) Creativity and Imagination:

There was no statistically significant difference in the pattern of overall ratings between ME and control or OE sending schools. There was an indication of difference at the extremes: MES lessons were more often rated at the creative extreme,

The proportion of "average" ratings received by the two sets of schools was approximately one third. The lessons in the ME schools received a rating of "above average" or "extremely" creative 37 per cent of the time compared to 24 per cent in the control schools. At the other extreme, MES lessons were rated "somewhat" or "very stereotyped" 28 per cent of the time, compared to the 44 per cent of control school lessons so rated.

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

Finding

and less often rated at the stereotyped extreme.

Source: ILOR

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Extremely creative	9	3	8
Above average creativity	28	21	24
Average creativity	35	32	29
Somewhat stereotyped	13	28	18
Very Stereotyped	15	16	21

6) Extent of, effectiveness of, and use of teaching aids:

There was a statistically significant difference: "Some" aids were more likely to be used in ME than control or OE sending school lessons.

Source: ILOR

While the percentage of lessons rated as showing both "varied and effective' use of aids was small in both MES and control lessons, two-fifths of the MES lessons were rated as showing "some, effective" use of aids compared to one-fifth of the control lessons. At the other extreme, three-fifths of the control lessons were rated as showing "little or no use" of aids, whereas only one-third of MES lessons were so rated.

Scale	MES	Per Cent Control	OE Sending
Varied and effective use	5	6	4
Some, effective use	38	22	31
Varied but ineffective	1	2	0
Some, but ineffective	19	10	16
Little or no use	37	60	49

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison | **Finding**

7) Relating lesson to material taught earlier:

There was no statistically significant difference between ME and control schools. However, there was a statistically significant difference between ME and OE sending schools, with more frequent references to material taught earlier in the OE sending schools.

Source: ILOR

Approximately three-quarters of all lessons involved "considerable" or "some" reference to material taught earlier.

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Considerable reference	18	16	31
Some reference	62	58	43
No reference	20	26	26

8) Establishing a foundation for future lessons:

There was no statistically significant difference between ME and control or OE sending school lessons.

Source: ILOR

Almost 90 per cent of all lessons offered "some" or "considerable" opportunity for continuity with future lessons, but the proportion rated as providing "considerable" opportunity in MES was 34 per cent compared to 22 per cent in the control schools.

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Considerable opportunity	34	22	28
Some opportunity	57	67	60
Little or no opportunity	9	11	12

9) Establishing a foundation for independent work by children:

There were no overall statistically significant differences

Source: ILOR

Eighty per cent of the lessons in the ME schools were rated as offering "some" or "considerable" opportunity for independent work by the children compared to 65 per cent of the control school lessons rated as offering this opportunity. On the other hand, 35 per cent of the control school lessons were seen as offering "little or no" opportunity for independent work, compared to 20 per cent in MES.

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

Finding

	Per Cent		
Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
Considerable possibility	28	20	25
Some opportunity	52	45	49
Little or no possibility	20	35	26

10) Relating lesson to children's own experences:

There was a statistically significant difference between ME and control lessons: More ME lessons were rated as providing "some opportunity," and fewer as "remote from the child's experience." However, there was no statistically significant difference between ME and OE sending school lessons.

Source: ILOR

Although in both sets of schools a majority of lessons were rated as offering the children "some" or "consistent" opportunity to relate the lesson to their own experiences, three-quarters of the MES lessons received these ratings compared to 62 per cent of the control school lessons. Furthermore, one-third of the control lessons were rated as "remote" from the child's experience, compared to the one-fifth so rated in MES.

Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
Consistent opportunities	19	17	21
Some opportunity	63	48	52
Remote from experience	18	35	27

School Atmosphere

11) Discipline in classrooms:

There was a statistically significant difference: Discipline was more frequently above average in ME than in either control or OE sending schools.

Source: GSR

In MES the control and quiet were rated sufficient for a "good" or "excellent learning atmosphere" three-quarters of the time, whereas in the control schools these above average ratings were given about half the time. Average ratings were assigned about a quarter of the time in both MES and control schools. The control schools had a proportionately higher percentage of ratings indicating "lack of sufficient control and quiet for an average learning atmosphere." No classes in either MES or control schools were considered "too chaotic and noisy for learning."

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison	Finding			
		Per Cent		
	Scale	MES	Control	OE Sending
	Sufficient control and quiet for excellent learning atmosphere	32	20	14
	Sufficient control and quiet for good learning atmosphere	43	33	36
	Sufficient control and quiet for average learning atmosphere	23	27	41
	Lack of sufficient control and quiet for an average learning atmosphere	2	20	9
	Too chaotic and noisy for learning	0	0	0

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison	Finding
12) Adaptation to Class Size (no comparisons were made)	One third of the MES lessons were rated as reflecting either an "excellent" (12 per cent) or "effective" (25 per cent) adaptation of materials to the class size. Another fifth (21 per cent) were rated as reflecting "some" adaptation. The remainder (42 per cent of the lessons) were rated as showing "little or no" adaptation to the class size.
13) Effect of larger class on effectiveness of the lesson (no comparisons were made)	Consistent with the ratings of little adaptation, only one-third of the time did the observers feel that a larger class would have "completely destroyed" (8 per cent) or "seriously impeded" (26 per cent) the effectiveness of the lesson they had just seen. Another fourth felt that a larger class would have made the lesson "somewhat less effective." Thus in 41 per cent of the lessons, the observers felt that the lesson would have been just as effective with a larger class.

Teacher Attitude and Behavior in Class

Estimates of teacher attitude and behavior in class are provided by the observer's completion of the Teacher Behavior Record (TBR) developed by Ryans. The TBR offers 19 bipolar adjective pairs reflecting attitudes and behavior and asks the respondent to rate the teacher being observed on a seven-point scale for each pair. In this study, observers used the negative ends of the scale relatively infrequently, and so for simplicity we have reduced the data to three gradations, negative, balanced, and positive, and have used these to present the data from the TBR in Table 17. The data are presented here for all grades combined, since the separate grades did not differ, and for all ME schools combined, since the Old and New ME schools did not differ.

A glance at the first two columns indicates that in ME, control, and OE sending schools the observers had positive perceptions of the teachers' attitudes and classroom behavior. In MES lessons, only for three characteristics did the proportion of positive ratings dip below 50 per cent, and for two of these (adaptability and broadness of perception) this proportion was 46 per cent. For originality, however, only 39 per cent of the ratings were positive. Differences in the ratings in ME and control schools were generally less than 10 per cent. For the five items where the differences were above 10 per cent the data indicate that, compared to teachers in control schools, teachers in ME schools were more likely to be rated as fair, understanding, democratic, adaptable, and original.

Comparing teachers in ME and OE sending schools, for 13 of the 19 characteristics the proportion of positive ratings was higher in the

Table 17

Distribution of Responses on Teacher Behavior Record
MES and Control Schools

	Proportion Who Gave Indicated Response								
	Positive			Balanced			Negative		
Characteristics	MES	Control	OE Send	MES	Control	OE Send	MES	Control	OE Send
1. Attractive-Unattractive	77	72	78	22	26	16	1	2	6
2. Steady-Erratic	76	68	75	21	18	17	3	14	8
3. Fair-Partial	70	51	76	23	31	15	7	18	9
4. Confident-Uncertain	70	64	76	25	24	14	5	12	10
5. Calm-Excitable	70	64	76	23	28	12	7	8	12
6. Systematic-Disorganized	69	61	76	20	25	13	11	14	11
7. Responsive-Aloof	68	64	64	19	23	14	13	13	22
8. Responsible-Evading	67	75	77	30	15	17	3	10	6
9. Alert-Apathetic	66	60	64	25	34	16	9	6	20
10. Fluent-Inarticulate	66	64	67	21	22	19	13	14	14
11. Kindly-Harsh	64	58	68	26	28	17	10	14	15
12. Understanding-Unsympathetic	62	50	66	24	39	18	14	11	16
13. Optimistic-Pessimistic	58	51	63	33	42	22	9	7	15
14. Democratic-Autocratic	58	43	54	26	41	21	16	16	25
15. Integrated -Immature	56	60	78	40	36	18	4	4	4
16. Stimulating-Dull	52	48	54	30	29	13	18	23	33
17. Adaptable-Inflexible	46	35	50	33	45	21	21	20	29
18. Broad-Narrow	46	43	61	43	49	25	11	8	14
19. Original-Stereotyped	39	26	36	34	32	28	27	42	36

OE schools, while it was higher in the ME school for the other six. Differences were seldom large, being 10 per cent or less for 17 items, and 5 per cent or less for twelve. The two larger differences were 15 per cent and 22 per cent and in both the teachers in the OE sending schools were more likely to be rated positively.

In addition to these group data, the data were analyzed by school. This analysis is of interest in reflecting once again the wide variation from school to school within the set of ME schools. There were two schools in which none of the nine teachers observed ever received a negative rating on any of the 19 characteristics. There were ten other schools in which negative ratings were assigned less than ten times. In four schools negative ratings were assigned between 12 and 19 times. At the other extreme were the four schools in which negative ratings were assigned between 26 and 36 times, averaging four per teacher.

CHAPTER V

EVALUATION OF SCHOOL ATTRACTIVENESS, CLIMATE, AND QUALITY, AND THE SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE MES PROGRAM

On the General School Report, the observers were asked to consider the ME or control school they had just seen as a total entity and evaluate its physical attractiveness, and its climate as expressed in the attitudes of administration staff, teachers, supplementary staff, and children. Then they were asked to make some overall judgment as to their feelings about the school. Then, in the ME schools only, they were asked an overall opinion about the MES program: if the school they had just seen was typical. Finally, they were asked to appraise two of the special features of the MES program, heterogeneous grouping and class size. This chapter will present these data.

The observers felt that the MES classrooms and school buildings were above average and often extremely attractive. They felt the same way about the school building of the control schools, but did not feel that the average control classroom was as attractive as the average MES classroom. Compared to OE sending schools, ME schools were considered more attractive in both building and classrooms. In terms of climate, the observers were laudatory about the general climate and specific attitudes in ME schools, and their ratings were consistently and dramatically more positive in this respect than in the control or OE sending schools. Attitudes of administration, teachers, supplementary and service staff in ME schools were almost unanimously rated as above average or outstanding. Seldom did the control or OE sending schools obtain these ratings. This same difference held for ME and OE schools for children's attitudes towards teachers. However, in the attitudes of children towards teachers, the ME and control school ratings were comparable. This was consistent with the data reported in the preceding chapters where, on the ILOR, the observers reported some differences between ME and control schools in teacher functioning, but not in children's functioning.

In terms of their overall ratings, half of the observers would have felt enthusiastic or strongly positive about sending their child to an ME school, a feeling not one of the observers had about any control school, and only 18 per cent had about any OE sending school. Similarly, all observers felt the instruction they had seen in the ME school was worth more than the average school day, whereas the instruction they had seen in the control school was not.[1] Obviously then, all recommended that MES be continued, although most wanted slight or considerable modifications. Observers who felt only "slight" modifications were needed made three suggestions with some frequency: in-service education to improve teachers' awareness of the concepts implied in MES; general improvement in teaching quality; and revision of the practices now used for ability level grouping. The observers who believed that "strong" modifications were needed almost unanimously mentioned the need for improvement in the quality of teaching as their primary modification. Next came their comment on the need for change in ability level grouping, and the need for in-service education.

---

[1] This question was not asked in OE sending schools.

Thus these two sets of suggested modifications were identical, with the only difference in the observer's opinion as to whether or not they involved "slight" or "strong" modification.

Finally, asked to appraise two of the special features of MES, the observers indicated that class size and heterogeneous grouping were ineffectively used more often than they were effectively used. The ratings for heterogeneous grouping in the Old ME schools were more positive than in the New ME schools, suggesting that experience with this feature may make a difference.

Below, the data for these specific aspects are presented, beginning with the items on attractiveness of school and class.

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison	Finding
1) Attractiveness of building: There was no statistically significant difference between ME and control schools. However, there was a difference between ME and OE sending schools. The school buildings were rated as more attractive among ME schools. Source: GSR	About two-thirds of both MES and control schools were considered of "greater than average" or "extreme" attractiveness. The remaining ratings were about evenly divided between "average" and "less than average" attractiveness.

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Extremely attractive	36	27	0
Greater than average attractiveness	31	33	13
Average	15	20	32
Less than average attractiveness	15	13	32
Generally unattractive	3	7	23

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

Finding

2) Attractiveness of classrooms:

There was a statistically significant difference: MES classrooms were considered more attractive than control classrooms or OE sending school classrooms.

Source: GSR

In MES 85 per cent of the ratings indicate that the classrooms were "consistantly very attractive" or that "most rooms" were attractive, whereas in the control schools these ratings were assigned 40 per cent of the time and over half the ratings were "some classrooms attractive."

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Consistently very attractive	48	13	0
Most rooms attractive	37	27	41
Some classrooms attractive	10	53	18
Most classrooms very unattractive	5	7	27
Consistenly unattractive	0	0	14

3) General School Climate:

There was a statistically significant difference: School climate was more positively rated in ME than in control or OE sending schools.

Source: GSR

One-third of the ratings of school climate in ME schools were "extremely positive" but none were so rated in the control schools. Moreover, three-fourths of the MES ratings were above average, compared to only one-fourth in the control schools.

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Extremely positive	30	0	5
Positive	45	27	27
Average	15	60	45
Negative	8	13	9
Extremely negative	2	0	14

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison	Finding

4) Attitude of administrative staff:

There was a statistically significant difference: The attitude was rated more positively in ME than in the control or OE sending schools.

Source: GSR

The majority of the ratings in both MES and control schools were "positive" or "extremely positive." The proportion of these above average ratings was about 25 per cent higher in ME than in control schools with "average" and below average ratings proportionately less frequent in ME schools.

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Extremely positive	43	21	14
Positive	31	29	36
Average	18	29	27
Negative	8	21	18
Extremely negative	0	0	5

5) General attitude of teaching staff toward children:

There was a statistically significant difference in pattern: A higher proportion of above average or extremely positive ratings were received by the ME schools than either the control or OE sending schools

Source: GSR

Seventy per cent of MES ratings were "extremely positive" or "positive" compared to no extremely positive and only 29 per cent "positive" ratings in the control schools. Thus only a quarter of the MES ratings were "average" whereas a majority of the control schools received that rating.

Scale	MES	Per Cent Control	OE Sending
Extremely positive	28	0	5
Positive	42	29	45
Average	26	57	36
Negative	2	14	9
Extremely negative	2	0	5

6) Attitude of supplementary professional and service staff:

Almost 70 per cent of MES schools received an "extremely positive" or "positive" rating compared to about 40 per cent of control schools, none of which received an "extremely positive" rating. At the other extreme, one-fourth of control ratings were below average,

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

Finding

There was a statistically significant difference in pattern: ME schools received a higher proportion of the above average ratings than did control or OE sending schools.

Source: GSR

but only 3 per cent of MES ratings were.

Scale	Per Cent MES	 Control	OE Sending
Extremely positive	20	0	
Positive	46	38	
Average	30	38	
Negative	3	24	
Extremely negative	0	0	

7) General Attitude of the children toward the teaching staff:

There was no statistically significant difference between ME and control or OE sending schools.

The attitude of the majority of students in both MES and control schools was rated as "positive" or "extremely positive." The proportion of these above average ratings was about 10 per cent higher in MES than in control schools, with "average" ratings proportionately less frequent in MES schools.

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Extremely positive	18	13	5
Positive	46	40	27
Average	28	40	54
Negative	5	7	14
Extremely negative	3	0	0

8) How observer would feel about having own child in school just visited:

There was a statistically significant difference: In ME schools a majority of observers would feel enthusiastic or strongly positive, in the control schools the majority would have negative feelings, as would, coincidentally

More than half of the observers noted that they would feel "enthusiastic" or "strongly positive" about having their child in the MES school they had just seen. One-third would have felt negatively about it. Not one observer felt "enthusiastic" or "strongly positive" about the control school as a place for his child and three-fourths reported they would feel negatively about it.

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison

Finding

the same majority (73 per cent) in the OE sending schools.

Source: GSR

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Enthusiastic	36	0	0
Definitely positive, but not enthusiastic	21	0	18
Slightly positive	13	27	9
Slightly negative	20	53	41
Strongly negative	10	20	32

9) Worth of pupil day:

There was a statistically significant difference in pattern: A pupil day was rated of greater monetary value in MES than in control schools.

Source: GSR

Forty per cent of the ratings for MES indicate that the pupil day was "worth more" than the average pupil day compared to 13 per cent of the ratings for the control schools. In contrast, one-fourth of the ratings said that the MES pupil days were "worth less" than an average pupil day.

Scale	Per Cent MES	Control	OE Sending
Worth more than average school day	40	13	
Worth Average	35	53	
Worth less than average school day	24	33	

10) Feeling of observer about MES program in general, if classes he observed were typical.

(no comparison data)

Source: GSR

No observer suggested "abolishing" the program, and only one in six (17 per cent) said "retain it as it is." Most often, (47 per cent) they said to retain it with "strong" modifications, and less often (36 per cent) they felt it needed only "slight" modifications.

11) Effectiveness of Heterogeneous grouping:

(no comparison data)

Source: GSR

Asked to rate the effectiveness with which they saw heterogeneous grouping employed, the observers gave different ratings in the Old and New ME schools. In the Old schools 42 per cent of the ratings indicated effective use, 47 per cent ineffective use, and 11 per cent indicated that

Aspect of Evaluation and Comparison	Finding
	opportunities to use it were not employed. In contrast, only 25 per cent of the ratings in the New ME schools indicated effective use, with 70 per cent indicating ineffective use, and 5 per cent a lost opportunity. The data make two points: experience with heterogeneous grouping makes a difference in the rating for effectiveness; at best, the observers were divided as to its effectiveness.
12) Class Size: (no comparison data) Source: GSR	In their ratings of the effectiveness with which the small class size was used, observers saw no difference between Old and New ME schools. As would be expected from the previous ratings on aspects of this feature, less than half (45 per cent) of the ratings indicated that class size was being used effectively, with the other 55 per cent indicating it was used ineffectively.

CHAPTER VI

EVALUATION OF THE MES PROGRAM IN THE EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES

As noted in the procedure chapter, this evaluation of MES considered the early childhood years separately, even to using a different team of observers, all of whom had professional specialization in early childhood education. The basic part of the evaluation of the early childhood years consisted of in-class observations conducted by these observers in four grades: prekindergarten kindergarten, grade one, and grade two. In addition, the General School Report was completed by these observers on the basis of their visits to these grades only. These data will also be presented.

Children's Functioning

Table 18 presents the observer ratings of the aspects of children's functioning studied on the ILOR. The table presents the data separately for each of the four early childhood grades. Table 18 presents the average of the ratings across the four grades.[1] For comparison, the table also includes the comparable data previously reported for these ME schools in grades three to six.

Looking at grade, there is no consistent pattern indicated in the data in Table 18. Except for kindergarten, each grade has the highest proportion of above average responses for at least one of aspects studied. In view of the lack of consistent pattern, Table 18, which presents the averages across grade provides the more useful referent for discussion.

---

[1] These are averages of the percentages for each grade, so that each grade has equal weight in the average even though different number of classes were seen at the different grades.

Table 18

Observer Ratings of ILOR Aspects of Children's Functioning, Early Childhood Years, by Grade

Aspect of Evaluation	Proportion Above Average				Proportion Average				Proportion Below Average			
	Pre-K	K	1	2	Pre-K	K	1	2	Pre-K	K	1	2
Interest & enthusiasm	54	44	67	77	31	44	22	15	15	12	11	8
Verbal fluency	39	12	67	15	23	44	22	69	38	44	11	16
Participation in Lesson	92	88	78	92	0	6	11	0	8	6	11	8
Spontaneous Questioning	10	7	0	8	10	28	0	8	80	65	100	84
Volunteering in response to question	58	46	74	54	14	18	13	15	28	36	13	31

The data in Table 19 suggest that the observers of the early childhood years saw children's functioning which they rated more positively than did the observers of the middle grades. Although differences were numerically small, for four of the five aspects, the proportion of above average ratings was higher in the early childhood years. As will be seen later in this chapter, this tendency for more positive early childhood ratings was more clearly evidenced in the ratings for teacher functioning and overall school quality.

Considering the modal ratings, the data in Table 19 indicate that the observers saw children functioning with above average interest and enthusiasm, and above average participation and volunteering. They saw average verbal fluency, and, as in the middle grades, little spontaneous questioning.

Teacher Functioning

As was done in the middle grades in the early childhood study, teacher functioning was estimated through several items on the ILOR and through the Ryans Teacher Behavior Record. Tables 20 and 21 present the data from the ILOR, and Table 22 presents the data from the TBR.

Ratings of In-Class Functioning

Of the seven aspects in Table 20 for which data were obtained in all four early childhood grades, the highest proportion of positive responses was obtained in grade one for four aspects. Other than this suggestion of a difference, there is no consistent pattern of difference from grade to grade indicated in these data. Therefore the data have been averaged across grade and these averages presented in Table 21, together with the comparative data for the middle grades.

For eleven of the twelve aspects studied, the proportion of above average

Table 19

Observer Ratings of ILOR Aspects of Children's Functioning, Early Childhood Years, With Comparative Data From Middle Childhood Years

Aspect of Evaluation	Proportion Above Average		Proportion Average		Proportion Below Average	
	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	Early Childhood	Middle Grades
Interest and enthusiasm	60	51	28	30	12	19
Verbal fluency	33	22	40	42	27	36
Participation in lesson	88	76	4	9	8	15
Spontaneous questioning	6	7	12	9	82	84
Volunteering in response to question	58	50	15	20	27	30

Table 20

Observer Ratings of ILOR Aspects of Teacher Functioning, Early Childhood Years, by Grade

Aspect of Evaluation	Proportion Above Average				Proportion Average				Proportion Below Average			
	Pre-K	K	1	2	Pre-K	K	1	2	Pre-K	K	1	2
Quality of lesson	54	37	55	67	15	31	45	25	31	32	0	8
Amount material covered	54	38	67	46	15	50	22	27	31	12	11	27
Depth of lesson	54	38	67	31	15	31	33	54	31	32	0	15
Planning & Organization	58	31	44	31	25	69	56	61	17	0	0	8
Creativity & Imagination	54	43	78	61	15	19	22	31	31	38	0	8
Use of teaching aids	23	25	63	15	31	19	25	62	46	56	12	23
Refer to earlier material	*	*	37	25	*	*	63	67	*	*	0	8
Foundation for future lessons	*	*	56	38	*	*	44	62	*	*	0	0
Foundation for independent work	*	*	22	27	*	*	67	55	*	*	11	18
Use of child's background	73	86	33	46	27	14	56	39	0	0	11	15
Use of class size	38	25	33	15	23	31	0	39	39	44	67	46
Effect of larger class size	23	13	22	37	38	31	11	27	39	56	67	36

---

*This aspect was not rated in this grade.

Table 21

Observer Ratings of ILOR Aspects of Teacher Functioning, Early Childhood Years, With Comparative Data From Middle Childhood Years

Aspect of Evaluation	Proportion Above Average		Proportion Average		Proportion Below Average	
	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	Early Childhood	Middle Grades	Early Childhood	Middle Grades
Quality of lesson	54	46	29	34	17	20
Amount material covered	51	40	29	44	20	16
Depth of lesson	48	38	33	40	19	22
Planning & Organization	29	20	59	51	12	29
Creativity & Imagination	59	37	22	35	19	28
Use of teaching aids	32	5	34	38	34	57
Refer to earlier material	31	18	65	62	4	20
Foundation for future lessons	47	34	53	57	0	9
Foundation for inde	24	28	62	52	14	20
Use of child's background	59	19	34	63	7	18
Use of class size	28	12	23	25	49	63
Effect of larger class size	24	8	27	26	49	66

Table 22

Observer Ratings of Teacher Attitude and Behavior, Teacher Behavior Record, Early Childhood and Middle Grades

Characteristic	Proportion Rated:					
	Positive		Balanced		Negative	
	E.C.	M.G.	E.C.	M.G.	E.C.	M.G.
1. Attractive------Unattractive	81	77	16	22	3	1
2. Confident-------Uncertain	80	70	10	25	10	5
3. Steady----------Erratic	78	76	19	21	3	3
4. Calm------------Excitable	75	70	18	23	7	7
5. Fair------------Partial	71	70	22	23	7	7
6. Fluent----------Inarticulate	71	66	22	21	7	13
7. Responsible-----Evading	69	67	23	30	8	3
8. Alert-----------Apathetic	63	66	25	25	12	9
9. Kindly----------Harsh	63	64	28	26	9	10
10. Understanding---Unsympathetic	62	62	27	24	11	14
11. Integrated------Immature	62	56	30	40	8	4
12. Optimistic------Pessimistic	61	58	29	33	10	9
13. Responsive------Aloof	61	68	22	19	17	13
14. Systematic------Disorganized	60	69	27	20	13	11
15. Adaptable-------Inflexible	54	46	27	33	19	21
16. Stimulating-----Dull	51	52	29	30	20	18
17. Democratic------Autocratic	48	58	32	26	20	16
18. Broad-----------Narrow	46	46	44	43	10	11
19. Original--------Stereotyped	44	39	26	34	30	27

ratings was higher in the early childhood years. Thus, the tendency noted for the five aspects involving children's functioning was even more strongly seen in these items on teacher functioning.

The one aspect for which a higher proportion of positive ratings occured for the middle grade involved the extent to which the teacher established a foundation for independent work. The difference was small, (4 per cent) and the item itself has differential relevance for the two sets of grades, so much so that it was omitted completely from the ILOR for prekindergarten and kindergarten. This exception then, hardly weakens the conclusion above, that ratings of teacher functioning were better in the early childhood grades.

Overall, the data combine to indicate that in the early childhood years the observers rated as above average, the quality, depth and amount of material covered in the lesson, creativity and imagination, and the extent to which a foundation was established for future lessons. They considered four other aspects as average: planning and organization, references to earlier materials, establishing a foundation for future work, and relating the materials to the child's own background and experience. There was no consistent evaluation of the use of aids in teaching, with the ratings evenly distributed. Finally, on the two items on the ILOR directly concerned with class size, the most frequent observer evaluation was that they saw little adaptation to the smaller class, and consequently, the lesson they observed could have been taught to larger classes with no loss of effectiveness.

Ratings of Teacher Attitude and Behavior

Table 22 presents the data from the observer rating of teacher attitude and behavior using the Ryans Teacher Behavior Record, for both the early childhood and middle grades. When analyzed by separate early childhood grades, there were no differences for these data, and when these grades were compared to the middle grades, there were no consistent differences either. Of the 19 characteristics, differences in the proportion of positive ratings exceeded five per cent for only six of the 19 characteristics studied, and never exceeded ten per cent.

Considering the picture of the early childhood teacher which comes through these data, she is almost always (71 per cent to 81 per cent) attractive, confident, steady, calm, fair, and fluent. Most of the time (60 per cent to 69 per cent) she exhibits more than average responsibility, alertness, kindliness, understanding, personality integration, optimism, and responsiveness. About half the time (44 per cent to 54 per cent) she was rated as exhibiting above average adaptability, stimulation, democratic manner, broad perceptions, and originality. Of these characteristics for only three were there any significant proportions of teachers rated at the negative end of the scale. One in three (30 per cent) were considered stereotyped rather than original, and one in five (20 per cent) considered dull or autocratic.

School Attractiveness, Climate and Quality

Table 23 presents the data from the GSR's completed by the observers based on their perception of a school after seeing early childhood classes only. For comparison, the table presents comparable data based on the GSR's from the observers who saw classes only in grades three to six. Except for the ratings on attractiveness of classrooms, the proportion of above average ratings was higher for those observers who saw the early childhood years only. Thus, they obtained an even more positive picture of the school than the highly positive picture we have already reported for the observers who saw the middle grades.

For example, above average ratings were given three-fourths or more of the

Table 23

Ratings of Overall School Characteristics, by Grades Observed

	Proportion of Ratings:					
	Above Average		Average		Below Average	
Aspect	E.C.[a]	M.G.[b]	E.C.	M.G.	E.C.	M.G.
General School Climate	91	75	9	15	0	10
Attitude of Administrative Staff	84	72	18	18	0	8
Attitude of Teaching staff	91	70	9	26	0	4
Attitude of Supplementary professional and service staff	78	67	22	30	0	3
Attitude of children towards teachers	73	64	27	28	0	8
Attractiveness of classrooms	54	85	46	10	0	5
Feelings About Own Child in School	64	57	27	13	9	30
Feelings About Worth of School Day	70	41	20	35	10	24

---

[a] E.C. = Early Childhood

[b] M.G. = Middle Grades

schools for the item on general school climate, as well as for all four of the items on attitude, with the proportion reaching 90 per cent for climate and teacher attitude. About two-thirds reported enthusiasm or strong positive feelings about having a child of their own in the school and 70 per cent noted that the pupil day they saw was worth more than the average day. For this last aspect particularly, the data were more positive in early childhood than in the middle grades, where only 41 per cent concluded their day feeling that the instruction they had seen was worth more than the average pupil day.

The one instance in which the ratings from the middle grades were more positive, involved the attractiveness of classrooms; whereas 85 per cent of the observers felt that most or all of the classrooms they had seen in grades three to six were attractive, only 54 per cent of the early childhood observers felt this way. This discrepancy either reflects differences in the two sets of classrooms, or else differences in standards of attractiveness for experts in early childhood education.

Feelings About MES as a Program

The observers in early childhood grades were also asked their feelings about the future of the MES program, and if the instruction they had just seen was believed to be typical. One third of them (36 per cent) felt it should be continued as is, without modification; a bit more than twice the proportion (17 per cent) of observers felt that way after seeing the middle grades. Consistently these observers noted that they felt it should be retained as is because of the fact that small classes and teacher-pupil ratios provide time for the teacher to think and to function. In both sets of grades, the other observers felt that the program should be retained but with modifications. The modifications suggested by the early childhood observers primarily involved creativity: either more creative and innovative teaching, or more teaching designed to help children be more aware, curious, and creative. In addition, these observers, like those in the middle grades, noted that the administrative changes would not be particularly fruitful unless improved teacher training and functioning accompanied them.

A final appraisal available from these observers is their rating of the effectiveness with which class size was used.[2] Here, they were somewhat more critical than the observers had been in the middle grades: only 27 per cent reported that they saw an effective adaptation to the small class, compared to 37 per cent in the upper grades. Two-thirds, (64 per cent) felt that the lessons they saw could have been as effectively taught with a larger class, compared to 58 per cent who felt this way in the middle grades. Thus, class size was used no more effectively in early childhood years than in the middle grades.

---

[2] These data came from the GSR, whereas data reported in Tables 20 and 21 on class size came from the ILOR.

CHAPTER VII

EVALUATION OF REACTIONS AND OPINIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE, TEACHING AND SUPPLEMENTARY PROFESSIONAL STAFF

As was noted in the procedure chapter, reaction of teaching, administrative, and supplementary staff was obtained in three ways. First, all principals of the 20 ME schools with middle elementary grades were individually interviewed to obtain their responses. Similarly, face to face individual interviews were conducted with 38 assistant principals and with supplementary professional staff.[1] To obtain teacher reactions, a brief questionnaire was sent to all teachers in the 21 ME schools. Of the 1143 sent out, 371 or 32.4 per cent were returned. These data provide one insight into teacher reaction. Another is provided by the 81 interviews conducted with a sample of the 271 teachers who, when returning the questionnaire, said that they would be willing to be interviewed.

The data obtained from these interviews would require a report in and of itself to be completely covered. To keep these data within the scope of this report, they will be handled in two ways. Those questions asked to which structured rating-type responses were obtained will be reported first. These questions have been grouped into three areas: general opinions about the program and relationships with parents; changes in curriculum, methods and materials; and pupil attitude and achievement. Responses in these three areas will be reported in three tables, with each table presenting the data separately for the 20 principals, 38 assistant principals, 81 classroom teachers, 20 cluster teachers, 25 in psychological services (19 guidance counselors and 6 school psychologists), 16 in social services (social workers and community coordinators).

---

[1] The number interviewed in each position were specified in the procedure chapter.

The responses of those interviewed to the relatively unstructured questions will then be presented. Finally, a profile of the principal will be presented, based on modal responses.

General Opinions About the Program and About Relationships with Parents

Table 24 presents the respondents' general opinions about the MES program and about the extent of their contact with parents. Considering first their overall feelings about the program, there was near unanimity in expressing enthusiasm or strong positive feelings. A difference existed only in the proportion who expressed enthusiasm rather than strong positive feelings, and this difference involved smaller proportions of teachers and those in psychological services being enthusiastic. The difference was particularly pronounced among the larger sample of teachers who responded to the questionnaire, for among these teachers only 32 per cent expressed enthusiasm, compared to 63 per cent of those interviewed.[2]

Asked the extent to which they believed the "MES concept" was implemented in their school, the various categories of respondents were again consistent: about one in five said it had been implemented completely,

---

[2] This difference suggests that those one hundred teachers who returned the questionnaire, but indicated that they were unwilling to be interviewed, held different attitudes than the 271 who were willing to be interviewed and from whom we selected a sample.

Table 24

Responses of Administration and Staff to Questions About MES in General and About Relationships with Parents

	Interview						
	Prin. N=20	Asst. Prin. N=38	Tchr. N=81	Clstr. Tchr. N=20	Psych G.C. N=25	Soc. Wk. C.C. N=16	Tchr. Quest. N=371
Feelings About Program							
Enthusiastic	70	79	63	75	58	75	32
Strongly Positive	30	13	22	15	42	19	54
Slightly Positive	0	5	6	0	0	6	6
Slightly Negative	0	3	0	0	0	0	1
Strongly Negative	0	0	3	0	0	0	2
Omit	0	0	6	10	0	0	5
Extent To Which Believe MES Concept Implemented In School							
Completely	20	18	32	25	8	19	
Considerably, not Completely	75	71	45	60	67	56	
About Halfway	5	3	15	15	12	25	
Less than Halfway	0	5	3	0	4	0	
Omit	0	3	5	0	9	0	
Opinion As To Continuation of MES							
Continue, as is	10		9	10	0	19	
Continue, with modification	25		38	20	33	43	
Expand, as is	25		15	10	9	0	
Expand, with modification	40		35	60	58	38	
Abolish	0		3	0	0	0	
Relationship with Parents							
Increased Substantially	50	26	29	35	38	56	
Increased Moderately	15	24	17	25	17	25	
Increased Slightly	0	5	2	0	0	13	
No change	15	18	31	15	8	0	
No basis for knowing, Omit	20	27	21	25	37	6	

and another half to three-fourths said it had been implemented considerably. Never more than 25 per cent, and usually fewer, felt the MES concept had been implemented half-way or less. Most convinced that there had been considerable or complete implementation were the principals (95 per cent), assistant principals (89 per cent) and cluster teachers (85 per cent).

Respondents who reported less than complete implementation were asked what they believed had hindered complete implementation. All levels of staff noted the newness of the program, and all principals, assistant principals, teachers, and specialists noted the problem of inexperienced teachers not prepared to function competently in an ME school. Not surprisingly, teachers and specialists, but not administrators, also noted problems of poor administration and supervision.

The third general question involved the respondents' opinions about the future of MES. Only a minority felt that the program should be continued or expanded "as is," without modification. Principals most often held this view (35 per cent), with those in psychological services holding it least often (nine per cent). Other than two per cent of the teachers interviewed, no one suggested abolishing the program and among the other respondents, more suggested expanding the program (59 per cent) as suggested, rather than continuing it within its current limits (39 per cent).

The principals who wanted to continue "as is," can be summarized in the views of the principal who said his current situation was his best "in 19 years." Those who wanted modifications had no one consistent modification. A few noted that the modifications to which they were referring involved nothing more than the full implementation of the original proposal for MES. Assistant principals were consistent: the modification they wanted most often involved improving the preparation of teachers and specialists, specifically in working with heterogeneous groups or small groups or in MES in general. Another frequent modification suggested by the assistant principals involved some adaptation of the self-contained classroom concept to cut down the movement of children and the variety of teachers.

Among the staff, those who wanted it maintained as is, or with slight modifications, usually simply stated that they believed the program was generally effective and valuable. Those who felt it needed stronger modifications consistently stated three opinions: the need for more specialists, particularly in guidance; less use of heterogeneous grouping, or less wide ranges used when heterogeneity is employed; and better screening of teachers and administrators.

The last item for which data are reported in Table 24 concerns the extent to which contact with the parents has changed since the MES program was instituted. Differences between the groups of respondents were greater for this question than the others, in part because many respondents felt they had little basis for making this judgment because of the limited time they had been in their present school. The consistent finding is that at least 46 per cent (classroom teachers) of all groups felt that there had been a moderate or substantial increase in contact with parents. As might be expected from their position, those in the social services areas most often (81 per cent) held this view.

Looking at the four questions summarized in Table 24, one would conclude that all staff positions interviewed were strongly positive about the MES program which they felt had been implemented in their school to a considerable degree, and which had resulted in moderate or substantial increases in parental contact. Given the modifications they suggested, they felt the program should at least be continued or even expanded.

Changes in Curriculum, Methods and Materials

Table 25 summarizes the views of the four respondent groups directly concerned with teaching in the areas of curriculum, methods, and materials. In most positions, a majority, rising to as high as 66 per cent of the assistant principals, reported that there had been moderate or substantial changes in curriculum. Principals usually specified general areas of change like "enrichment," helping "slower" or "superior" children, or areas in which they believed they saw improvement in functioning like reading and speech. They did not specify what might be considered content changes in curriculum other than the two who noted an emphasis on teaching Negro children about their heritage, and two who felt that less time was now devoted to science and social studies. The assistant principals almost unanimously mentioned an emphasis on "the three R's" as well as on language arts specifically, again with no references to differential content. Staff, also, most often referred to general enrichment, but several did make specific references to intensification in the mathematics or reading program.

As to changes in method of instruction, again, large majorities in each position reported the belief that there had been change, and that

Table 25

Responses of Administration and Teaching Staff to Questions About Changes in Curriculum, Methods, and Materials

Question	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	Teacher	Cluster
Have there been Changes in Curriculum?				
Yes, substantial changes	20	37	17	20
moderate changes	40	29	18	20
slight changes	15	5	3	5
No, no changes	25	0	34	25
No Basis for Answer, Omit	0	29	28	30
Have there been Changes in Method of Instruction?				
Yes, substantial changes	45	55	37	40
moderate changes	30	6	34	35
slight changes	5	0	5	0
No, no changes	20	0	8	20
No Basis for Answer, omit	0	39	16	5
Have Provisions For Special Materials Been Adequate?				
Yes	65	89	78	95
No	35	8	22	5
Omit	0	3	0	0
How Effective Have These Materials Been?				
Very Effective	40	42	65	60
Moderately Effective	50	50	18	40
Slightly Effective	5	5	9	0
Not Effective	0	0	5	0
No Basis for Answer, Omit	5	3	3	0

it had been moderate or substantial. Only among the principals and cluster teachers did as many as 20 per cent say that they felt there had been no changes. Fifteen of the 20 principals specifically noted the use of cluster teachers and the subsequent institution of more planning and grade conferences. Other changes frequently noted by principals were greater use of audiovisual materials and a general feeling that there now was better provision for the children's individual needs. Five referred to grouping, two to heterogeneous grouping being introduced, and three to the use of homogeneous grouping for small ability groups. The assistant principals, too, most often noted the use of cluster teachers and teaching specialists as well as the use of small groups and greater individualization. Teaching staff held similar views, the most frequently cited of which were changes that involved smaller classes and the subsequent increase in individualization. Staff also noted the greater teamwork among the teaching faculty, the greater flexibility that MES provided, and the greater availability, and consequently use, of supplementary materials.

Asked specifically about the special materials provided them, most agreed that provisions for materials had been adequate, with the principals most often (35 per cent) saying that they had not. Finally, when asked to evaluate the special materials which had been provided, almost unanimously, in all four positions, the respondents believed that they had been very, or moderately effective. Administrators noted that they had "carte blanche" in ordering, and that this, plus the ready availability of the materials in school, made for effective use. A few noted the qualification that materials in and of themselves are not the key to good teaching. Staff, too, felt that availability was the key to the effective use of materials and that the materials did stimulate better "in-depth teaching" and higher pupil motivation.

Pupil Attitude and Achievement

Table 26 presents the views of all six respondent groups on two questions about pupil attitude, and of the four groups directly involved in teaching, on changes in levels of achievement since the introduction of the MES program.

All agree that there had been at least moderate changes in pupil attitude towards learning and school, so that the attitudes now are positive. The contrary view is seldom held: at most, 11 per cent (of the teachers) say that there has been no change, and never more than five per cent of any group believes the pupil attitude towards learning and school is now typically negative. These perceptions of the respondents are corroborated by the data from My Class and My School, reported earlier, which indicated that the pupils' perceptions are basically positive in this area.

However, the respondents' perceptions of change in level of achievement contradict the actual achievement data reported earlier. Almost all those who felt that they had been in the school long enough to respond to this question reported that there had been at least a moderate increase in the level of achievement in the language arts. Only the classroom teachers ever expressed doubts: seven per cent felt it had not changed, or was lower. Yet the data reported earlier for one of the

Table 26

Responses of Administration and Staff to Questions About Changes in Pupil Attitude and Achievement

Question	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	Teacher	Cluster	Psych. GC	Soc. Wk. CC
Changes in attitude of pupils toward learning and school.						
Yes, substantial	95	60	33	35	12	6
Yes, moderate	5	0	25	35	33	13
Yes, slight	0	3	2	5	0	19
No	0	0	11	5	4	0
No Basis for Answer, Omit	0	37	29	20	51	62
Nature of pupils' attitudes now toward learning and school.						
Extremely positive	30	8	20	15	4	13
Positive	70	47	54	55	50	31
Slightly positive	0	8	11	15	8	13
Slightly negative	0	5	3	0	4	0
Negative	0	0	1	5	0	0
No Basis for Answer, Omit	0	32	11	10	34	43
Changes in level of achievement in language arts.						
Yes, substantially higher	90	57	54	45	*	*
Yes, moderately higher	5	3	23	35		
Yes, slightly higher	0	3	5	10		
Yes, but lower	0	0	2	0		
No, no change	0	0	5	0		
No Basis for Answer, Omit	5	37	11	10		
Changes in level of achievement in mathematics.						
Yes, substantially higher	0	42	26	15	*	*
Yes, moderately higher	80	18	36	20		
Yes, slightly higher	15	3	8	15		
No, no change	0	0	11	10		
No Basis for Answer, Omit	5	37	19	40		
Changes in level of achievement in other academic areas.						
Yes, substantially higher	70	39	27	40	*	*
Yes, moderately higher	20	13	36	20		
Yes, slightly higher	0	3	9	0		
Yes, but lower	0	0	4	0		
No	0	0	7	0		
No Basis for Answer, Omit	10	45	17	40		

---

*There were some children in this category but too few to round to 1 per cent.

language arts, reading, showed no overall change. The apparent contradiction may be explained in two ways: first, reading is just one of the language arts, and teachers and administrators undoubtedly were considering them all. Even more important, the teacher of any one class sees that class from September to June, and as we reported earlier, looked at during that period of time, there is improvement in reading.

A majority within all groups was convinced that there had been a change in level of achievement in mathematics as well, although consistently smaller proportions felt that it was substantial, while higher proportions felt it was slight or had not changed. These reservations are consistent with the earlier data, for even within any one year, the improvement in arithmetic was not as great as that in reading.

Finally, asked a general question about changes in level of achievement in other academic areas like science and social studies, the respondents reported that, here too, they saw moderate or substantial improvements.

Overall then, these data combine to an extremely positive picture of pupil attitude and functioning, as the administrative and teaching staff see the pupils. These data, combined with the paper and pencil data on attitude and achievement, also illustrate how different data can reinforce or contradict each other. In the area of pupil attitude, both kinds of data indicate positive current attitudes. In the areas of achievement, the objective data do not show the improvement that the staff believes it has seen.

The Free Response Questions

Asked a variety of free response questions as to aspects of the MES program which they found valuable and those which they found disappointing, all staff levels were consistent in responding similarly so that their views can be summarized simply in terms of four points:

1) The single most significant feature of the MES program in everyone's mind is the smaller class size. This was often cited in and of itself as a virtue, but also mentioned in conjunction with the greater pupil participation it made possible, as well as the increased opportunity for teacher-pupil interaction. No one, at any staff level, ever had anything but kind words to say about this feature. This was also the feature most often recommended when respondents were asked what features of the MES program could be implemented on a citywide basis.

2) Although not as unanimously positive as those for class size, the second most favorable set of comments involved the specialists. While reservations were expressed that their role was in need of clarification and definition, and interpersonal problems of their functioning in a school needed elimination, there was agreement that they were an important and basic aspect of the program and were being used effectively.

3) There was also overwhelming agreement that the basic problem in the ME schools was staff functioning and selection. All levels of staff agreed that there was a need for rigorous and special preparation to teach effectively in an ME school, and that teachers currently there had not had this preparation, and were not receiving it. Administrators,

like our observers, noted that teachers were teaching as they always did, and teachers, too, noted the need for help in this area of methodology. From the administrators' point of view, the big problem was staff inexperience, instability, lack of preparation, and what they, the administrators, referred to as lack of understanding of the MES concept. They would remedy this by giving the principal greater control over the selection and retention of teaching staff, and by developing a special program for preparation of teachers to function in an ME school. As noted earlier, teaching staff agreed with this view, but also felt that comparable concern should be paid to the selection and preparation of administrative staff, in that supervision and administration of an ME school too, involved special skills and knowledge not generally part of the preparation of the school administrator.

4) Less pronounced, but equally consistent was the concern and doubt about two aspects of the current practices in school organization which characterize the MES program. We have already noted the generally negative evaluation of the way in which heterogeneous grouping has been employed, although some, primarily assistant principals, felt that it had important social and motivational advantages. The objections to its implementation almost always were qualified by the comment that teachers did not like the concept of heterogeneous groups, in large part because they had not been prepared to work with them, so this factor may have colored some attitudes towards implementation. The second administrative aspect involved the extent to which the school organization involves the movement of children and fragmentation of the school day.

Assistant principals expressed this most frequently, noting that they felt some revision was necessary to make for a more self-contained classroom, but teachers and specialists, too, were concerned with what they perceived as overly complex schedules interfering with the teaching process.

The same points above were seen once again when respondents, at the conclusion of the interview, were asked what recommendations they would make to improve the program, and what aspects of the program could be implemented in other schools throughout the city. Their most frequent recommendation involved aspects of the selection and preparation of administrators and teachers. Although few had specific suggestions other than a pay incentive, special training programs, or cooperation of the United Federation of Teachers, the view was frequently expressed that "some way" must be found to get well prepared, experienced teachers into the ME schools. Frequent comments were also made about the need to review the scheduling and organization of the ME school, with specific reference to heterogeneous grouping and the movement of children. Less often cited were recommendations to more clearly define the role of the teaching specialist, to pay more attention to guidance, to increase parent involvement, and finally, most often from assistant principals, to introduce more variation into all aspects of the program in an experimental and evaluative context.

As noted earlier, all levels interviewed believed that if funds and personnel were available, the smaller class and the availability of specialists and cluster teachers could profitably be introduced throughout the school system.

Principal Profile, Based on Modal Responses

Based on in-depth interviews of 20 MES principals, a picture of the "typical" principal's attitudes toward the ME program emerges.

Our typical principal has positive feelings about small class size; he sees it as an opportunity for greater familiarity on the part of the teacher with the strengths and weaknesses of each child. He may question the teachers' ability to take advantage of the small class in organizing lessons, but his more pressing problem is the issue of heterogeneous grouping. In general, the principal feels that heterogeneously grouped classes are more difficult to teach and that his teachers are not sufficiently well trained in handling this type of class. While he thinks that heterogeneous grouping has some good aspects, he is nonetheless concerned that the program is too heavily weighted toward the slower child.

While supervisory personnel now have more time for teacher training and curriculum development, the principal sees the proliferation of personnel in the school as having both advantages and disadvantages. In terms of his own work, he feels that his job has become more difficult because of the sheer numbers of staff members in the school. He feels a loss of personal contact and influence over the staff because it is too big. Similarly, he sometimes feels that there are too many things going on, and that he cannot keep his fingers on everything. On the other hand, our principal feels that he has more time to start worthwhile projects and coordinate staff efforts. His greater number of assistant principals have more staff contacts in terms of supervision.

For himself, there is now a greater involvement with the community, and he may notice that his work seems more interesting.

When asked what his staff thought of the ME program, he feels that staff attitudes reflect prior experience. Those teachers who had prior service in other schools liked it. He feels that they like the small class size best, and the degree of their liking it is reflected in small staff turnover. Those who had no experience elsewhere were less likely to be enthusiastic, while some staff objected to working with another teacher.

The principal feels that team teaching is effective, but that staff effectiveness is dependent on teachers' interest and involvement. He feels that his teachers would react to withdrawal of the ME program as if it were catastrophic and disastrous, because of the loss of teaching assistants, the need to go back to larger classes, the loss of daily preparation periods, and the shutdown of an experiment in which they saw good results.

Similarly, the parents would be upset and angry and would perceive such a shutdown as a blow to educational programs. Aside for the atypical parent who does not see auxiliary services as important, or who is dissatisfied because he expected more, faster, our principal feels that parents realize the benefits of MES and are strong backers of the program. They like the small classes and involvement with school staff.

The principal has designed several programs for involving the parents. A close relationship between the parents and the school has often been achieved through the efforts of the community coordinator and the guidance counselor. Parent workshops, such as sewing clubs, have been developed, as well as English classes for Spanish-speaking parents. There is a close tie with the parents' association, but the principal is sometimes concerned with the small number of parents who attend parent meetings, or the lack of affiliation of his parents' association with the United Parents' Association. When he has a community coordinator, a workshop that is led by a guidance counselor, he feels they are more successful.

Workshops are also going on for staff in the areas of human relations, reading guidance, and the use of audiovisual aids. Periodic meetings and conferences with assistant principals contribute to in-service training. The principal feels that more meetings of cluster teachers as well as grade teachers has led to improved methods and techniques of instruction. Greater use of audiovisual and Science Research Associates materials are also important improvements. The principal feels that his staff is now better able to meet individual needs, giving greater enrichment to the more able student and at the same time providing more help for the slower one. The increased size of the teaching staff has provided stress on enrichment, and our principal believes these added features allow for better evaluation of each student's skills, as well as diagnosis of difficulties.

In some instances he feels that methods, materials, and management of learning have changed; he offers the example of greater emphasis on Negro heritage. He is nevertheless concerned that there is less time being allowed for areas like science and social studies.

When asked about the kinds of things he was able to do in an ME school that he could not do in another school, the principal felt most strongly that he could spend more time observing teachers, often with an assistant principal, and that he could expect and realize more from each staff member. He experiences closer and more effective contact with teachers, parents, and community, and has greater use of supplementary personnel because of the contract with the United Federation of Teachers. Occasionally, our principal experiences the feeling that he has less contact with classrooms and individual children, and he sometimes feels that the school is so big that communication has become too complex and difficult.

Our principal feels more than enthusiastic about recommending features of the ME program for citywide use. He feels that larger staff, smaller classes, increased services, and earlier admission of children should all be incorporated, with perhaps a change in name from MES. He is not unaware of the problems of implementing these features in terms of insufficient personnel available, lack of other principals understanding the operation of MES, lack of space, his feeling that cluster teachers are sometimes least effective, and that heterogeneous grouping presents a teaching problem.

How would our principal improve the ME program? His foremost suggestion is that the principal should have a greater say about choosing the staff, as well as the number of them needed for various positions. He should also have the authority to transfer undesirable personnel. He feels he needs better trained teachers, and that more publicity must be given to the ideal program. He feels that MES must be given whatever it needs, even to building schools to order--especially larger classrooms.

Our principal wants more teacher training under assistant principals as well as a review of heterogeneous grouping. He wants more guidance classes but a decrease in the total number of personnel. He would be interested in experimenting with nongraded teaching and would like to see an in-depth study to explain why children do not learn to read.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

In the introduction to this report, we noted our belief that this study, conducted during the third year of the MES program, belonged to the family of short-term evaluations which were suggestive rather than definitive. It is well to reiterate that belief as we note what the project coordinator has concluded about the MES program based on consideration of all of the data.

Even at this early point in the life of the MES program four major conclusions seem evident:

1) Although introduced as a "program," and although the essential administrative features of the MES program have been introduced into all participating schools, there was great variation from school to school on every criterion we considered. Thus, in any overall appraisal of the "program" one must constantly be aware that this is a deceptive, if necessary generalization which obscures the real differences from school to school. This also suggests an obvious next step in research and evaluation: to seek to identify what distinguishes the schools in which the MES concept had been more effectively implemented from those in which it has been less effectively implemented.

2) In the areas of overall school climate and staff attitude as sensed by observers, and as reported by administrative staff and teaching faculty, it is clear that in most of the schools in which the MES program has been established, there was an atmosphere and climate characterized by enthusiasm, interest, and hope, and a belief among all levels of staff that they were in a setting in which they could function. Moreover, parents and community, too, have responded with interest and enthusiasm to the

MES program in their neighborhood schools. The creation of such positive feelings and climates in a school system which in recent years has evidenced considerable internal stress and school-community conflict is an important accomplishment. It makes clear that school climate can be improved and that community relationships can be developed within a brief period of time.

3) Equally clear, are the data which indicate that the MES program has made no significant difference in the functioning of children, whether this was measured by observers rating what children did in class, and how they do it, or whether it was measured by children's ability in mathematics or reading on standardized tests. The data of this evaluation show that children in classes in ME schools were not behaving any differently than children in classes in the officially designated control schools or in classes in other special service schools. The achievement test data showed that the profiles of the ME schools were no different than the profiles of these same schools before the program was instituted. Moreover, the academic year gains which previous evaluations had noted, were not maintained over the calendar year, so that overall, in most grades in the Old ME schools after three years of MES, the retardation below the urban norms used for reading was no better, and in some cases worse. Children tested in the fourth grade and fifth grade after three years of MES, were further behind the standards of normal progress than when they began the program, and children tested in the sixth grade were no better off. The data from this current evaluation, when compared to the data from previous evaluations, indicates that the MES program has a brief positive effect on achievement, which is not maintained across the summer and moreover is not maintained beyond the first year or two

of the program. We see in these data no reason to expect better achievement in reading or arithmetic from the MES program as now constituted, nor any reason to believe that the program will result in significant alteration in the pattern of increasing retardation as a child progresses through the grades. A clue to the discrepancy between the positive finding in the area of morale and climate, and negative finding in the area of academic achievement, is provided by the fourth clear finding.

4) Despite the administrative and organizational changes, little has happened in the way of innovation or restructuring in the basic teaching process. Observers noted that a majority of lessons they saw could have been taught to larger classes with no loss in effectiveness. When asked about changes in "method of instruction," administrators and teachers alike pointed to the small class and the use of specialists and cluster teachers, which we would consider administrative changes rather than changes in methods of instruction. All levels of staff noted that the basic weakness of the program, or their major disappointment with it, centered about the functioning of teachers, which they attributed to inexperience and lack of preparation. All of these comments combine to a general agreement that in the absence of specific preparation, teachers have not revised techniques of instruction to obtain the presumed instructional advantages of the small class and the availability of specialized instruction. In view of this, the lack of academic progress is not surprising.

In the sense of some overall conclusion, we believe that this evaluation of the 1966-67 program in the More Effective Schools indicates that a basic administrative restructuring of a school so that classes are smaller, teach pupil ratio significantly reduced, and specialized teaching, psychological, social, and health services provided, will have a dramatic impact on the attitudes and perceptions of the adults who function in, or observe that school. This is true of the adults who administer the school or teach in it, or of the adults who see it because their children attend it, and also of the adults who enter to observe it as members of an evaluation team. But these administrative changes, although elaborate and expensive in terms of both money and professional time, will not, in and of themselves, result in improvement in children's functioning. Hopefully, comparable radical revision and restructuring in direct aspects of the instructional process like curriculum, and methods of instruction, would achieve such improvement.

This overall conclusion will not be startling to those who developed, and those familiar with the original proposal for MES. Within that proposal appear references to "a dynamic reshaping of the...curriculum ..."[1] The development of special programs and procedures involving "the invention and refinement of new practices created directly to meet the urgencies of the More Effective School Program,"[2] teacher involvement in "...experimentation, (and) exploration of new methodology..."[3]

In this sense this evaluation shows that only portions of the MES concept have been implemented, specifically, those portions concerned with school organization, whereas those recommendations concerned with innovation, invention, experimentation, and change in the teaching process have not. Thus we believe it is critical that the reader recognize that this evaluation of the

---

[1] Report of Joint Planning Committee, p. 1.

[2] Ibid, p. 7.

[3] Ibid, p. 14.

MES program, as it existed in 21 schools during the academic year 1966-67, can only be considered a limited evaluation of the MES concept as originally outlined and proposed. Until such time as these other aspects of the proposal are introduced, it will not be possible to more fully evaluate the impact of this concept.

APPENDIX A

STATISTICS DESCRIBING SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM

Prepared and written by Leonard Moriber
of the Bureau of Educational Program
Research and Statistics, New York City,
New York.

Introduction

As was noted earlier in this report, one of the purposes of the 1966-67 evaluation of MES was to continue the analysis of factors such as class size, ethnic composition, and cost, previously presented in the 1965-66 evaluation completed by the Bureau of Educational Research. Through the cooperation of Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, director of the Bureau, these data were made available and are presented in this Appendix, as written by Dr. Moriber of the Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics.

Average Class Size and Pupil-Teacher Ratio

Average class size and pupil-teacher ratio for elementary grades one through eight in the More Effective Schools, the Community Zoned Schools, the Special Service Schools, and citywide elementary schools for the period October 31, 1963 through October 31, 1966, are presented in Table 1. These data were obtained from the Office of the Elementary Schools of the New York City Board of Education.

Average class size and pupil-teacher ratio are not the same. Average class size is obtained by dividing the total pupil register by the numbers of organized classes in a school. Pupil-teacher ratio reflects the impact of all authorized teaching positions in a school, whether or not the teacher is in charge of an organized class. This ratio is obtained by dividing the total pupil register of a school by the total number of authorized teaching positions in that school.

TABLE 1

Average Class Size and Pupil-Teacher Ratio, More Effective Schools Community Zoned Schools, Special Service Schools, and Citywide Elementary Schools - Elementary Grades One Through Eight October 1963 Through October 1966

	Average Class Size October				Pupil-Teacher Ratio October			
Type of School	1963	1964	1965	1966	1963	1964	1965	1966
More Effective Schools	28.3	24.6	20.5	20.1	25.0	14.1	12.3	12.3
Community Zoned Schools	28.8	23.9	22.5	21.4	25.1	18.2	17.0	16.1
Special Service Schools	27.9	28.1	27.9	27.2	24.2	23.2	22.8	20.9
Citywide Elementary Schools	29.5	29.1	28.7	27.7	26.1	24.7	23.1	21.9

In the More Effective Schools average class size declined from 28.1 to 20.1, a decline of 8.0 during the period October 1963, through October 1966. In the Community Zoned Schools average class size declined from 28.8 to 21.4, a decline of 7.4 during the same period. The sharpest declines were found in October 1964, when average class size in the MES and Community Zoned Schools declined by 3.7 and 4.9, respectively, from the previous October. In citywide elementary schools the decline in average class size during the October 1963 through October 1966 period was much less striking. During this period, average class size declined from 29.5 to 27.7, a decline of 1.8.

Changes in pupil-teacher ratio during the period were even more marked. In the More Effective Schools, pupil-teacher ratio declined from 25.0 to 12.3, a decline of 12.7 during the period October 1963 through October 1966. In the Community Zoned Schools the pupil-teacher ratio declined from 25.1 to 16.1, a decline of 9.0 during the same period. In all citywide elementary schools, pupil-teacher ratio declined from 26.1 to 21.9, a decline of 4.2 during the October 1963 through October 1966 period. Again, the sharpest declines in the More Effective and Community Zoned Schools occurred on October 1964, when the ratios declined by 10.9 and 6.9, respectively, from the previous October.

The trend towards lower average class sizes and pupil-teacher ratios in the types of schools studied is the result of a Board of Education policy to provide additional teaching positions, whenever possible, to all elementary schools in the New York City school district, but especially to such experimental projects as the More Effective Schools and Community Zoned Schools that the objectives of these programs be realized. Though pupil register in the New York City elementary schools has increased steadily during the period studied, provision of additional teaching positions has proceeded at a far more rapid rate, especially in the More Effective and Community Zoned Schools, thus accounting for the more dramatic declines in their average class size and pupil-teacher ratio.

Average Class Size and Pupil-Teacher Ratio in the Control Schools

Comparisons of average class size and pupil-teacher ratio between the MES and the nine control schools will better illustrate the impact of additional teaching positions and additional organized classes in the MES. On October 31, 1966, the average class size in the control schools was 28.5 while in the MES it was 20.1. As of the same date, pupil-teacher ratio in the control schools was 22.2 while in the MES it was only 12.3.

Ethnic Composition of Pupil Register

Tables 2 and 3 present data on the number and percentage of Puerto Rican, Negro, and other pupils enrolled in the More Effective Schools for the period

October 1963 through October 1966. For all the schools, data for the year immediately preceding that in which they became participants in the MES program as well as data for a number of years afterwards are presented. Data for four years are generally available for these schools which became MES in September 1964, and data for three years are generally available for those schools which became MES in September 1965.

For the schools established MES in September 1964, changes in the proportion of each ethnic group were found for all schools combined for the period October 1963 through October 1966. During this period the proportion of Puerto Rican and Negro pupils increased by 4.4 per cent and 2.1 per cent, respectively, while the proportion of other pupils declined by 6.5 per cent. Examination of the data for each school separately showed that the majority changed very little in ethnic composition during the October 1963 through October 1966 period. Pl X in the Bronx was an exception. In this school the Puerto Rican population increased by 9.2 per cent, while the Negro population declined by 8.3 per cent. The proportion of other pupils remained fairly constant. At PS 120 Brooklyn the changes were also more striking. During the period under study the proportion of Puerto Rican pupils increased by 7.5 per cent while the proportion of other pupils declined by 4.7 per cent.

Analysis of the data for the group of schools established as MES in September 1965, shows slightly different findings. For all schools combined, during the period October 1964 through October 1966, the proportion of Negro pupils in these schools increased by 6.2 per cent, while the proportion of other pupils declined by 8.1 per cent. The proportion of Puerto Rican pupils in these schools increased only slightly over the period.

If the data are examined for each school individually, the findings show interesting variations. For the eight schools for which three year comparison data are available, P 80 Brooklyn showed the largest decline in the proportion of other pupils (21.8 per cent) during the period studied. In all, two schools (P11 M, P110 X) showed increases in the proportion of other pupils during the period, while six schools (P168 M, P80 K, P165 K, P37 Q, P183 Q, P31 Q) showed declines in the proportion of other pupils on register. P80 Brooklyn showed the largest increase in the proportion of Negro pupils during the October 1964 through October 1966 period (14.4 per cent). In all, six schools (P11 M, P110 X, P80 K, P165 K, P183 Q, P31 R) showed increases in the proportion of Negro pupils on register during the period, while two schools (P168 M and P37 Q) showed declines in the proportion of Negro pupils enrolled.

Analysis of the data for the Puerto Rican pupils in the 11 new MES schools for the period October 1964 through October 1966, showed that in six schools the proportion of Puerto Rican pupils on register increased during the period, while in two schools the proportion declined. For the remaining three schools, no three year trend comparisons are possible since these schools were opened and occupied for the first time in September 1965.

Table 2

Numbers of Puerto Rican, Negro and Other Pupils on Register in Ten Elementary Schools Designated as More Effective Schools at Start of 1964-1965 School Year
October 1963 Through October 1966

	School	October 1963				October 1964				October 1965				October 1966			
		PR	N	O	Total	PR	N	O	Total	PR	N	O	Total	PR	N	O	Total
4	P83M*	-	-	-	-	798	269	76	1143	723	238	67	1028	744	204	51	999
6	P100M	11	1177	0	1188	11	1022	0	1033	9	1029	2	1040	22	1033	0	1055
4	P154M*	-	-	-	-	68	1013	3	1084	50	1025	1	1076	45	833	0	928
7	P 1X	477	529	120	1126	403	422	109	934	536	411	103	1050	526	396	99	1021
12	P102X	114	160	624	898	93	154	558	805	106	131	529	766	149	180	558	887
11	P106X	123	160	616	899	107	152	538	797	107	139	549	795	120	168	567	855
16	P120K**	770	202	92	1064	868	198	46	1112	828	188	52	1068	850	172	42	1064
17	P138K	81	923	50	1054	82	1011	52	1145	76	1196	38	1310	87	1270	33	1390
28	P 40Q	27	701	3	731	29	900	2	931	39	1046	3	1088	31	993	22	1046
30	P 18R	49	350	436	835	36	341	450	827	33	356	522	911	31	387	499	917
	Total	1652	4202	1941	7795	2495	5482	1834	9811	2507	5759	1866	10132	2605	5686	1871	10162

Numbers of Puerto Rican, Negro and Other Pupils on Register in Eleven Elementary Schools Designated as More Effective Schools at Start of 1965-1966 School Year
October 1964 Through October 1966

3	P 11M	-	-	-	-	372	40	180	592	412	77	290	779	378	87	220	685
2	P146M*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	433	350	66	849	489	344	80	913
2	P168M	-	-	-	-	722	490	152	1364	505	274	47	826	600	247	27	874
8	P110X	-	-	-	-	510	571	22	1103	447	524	26	997	436	617	27	1080
18	P 41K*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	277	636	23	936	264	539	24	827
21	P 80K	-	-	-	-	346	202	477	1025	206	140	153	499	213	176	128	517
18	P165K	-	-	-	-	124	671	224	1019	109	433	178	720	117	541	108	766
13	P307K*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	120	265	8	393	148	456	118	722
29	P 37Q	-	-	-	-	9	416	74	499	46	396	83	525	41	477	60	578
27	P183Q	-	-	-	-	126	456	401	983	125	417	340	882	131	417	330	878
30	P 31R***	-	-	-	-	34	258	249	541	42	294	246	582	57	386	327	770
	Total	-	-	-	-	2243	3104	1779	7126	2700	3806	1460	7988	2874	4287	1449	8610

---

*Data unavailable; school not opened at time of special census.
**Formerly P24K
***Formerly P17R

Table 3

Per Cent of Puerto Rican, Negro, and Other Pupils on Register in Ten Elementary Schools Designated as More Effective Schools at Start of 1964-65 School Year October 1963 Through October 1966

	Per Cent of Total											
	October 1963			October 1964			October 1965					
School	PR	N	O	PR	N	O	PR	N	O	PR	N	O
P 83M*		*		69.9	23.5	6.6	70.4	23.1	6.5	74.4	20.5	5.1
P 100M	0.9	99.1	0.0	1.1	98.9	0.0	0.9	98.9	0.2	2.1	97.9	0.0
P 154M*		*		6.2	93.5	0.3	4.8	95.2	0.0	4.9	95.1	0.0
P 1X	42.4	47.0	10.6	43.1	45.2	11.7	51.1	39.1	9.8	51.6	38.7	9.7
P 102X	12.7	17.8	69.5	11.6	19.1	69.3	13.8	17.1	69.1	16.8	20.3	62.9
P 106X	13.7	17.8	68.5	13.4	19.1	67.5	13.5	17.5	69.0	14.0	19.6	66.4
P 120K**	72.4	19.0	8.6	78.1	17.8	4.1	77.6	17.6	4.8	79.9	16.2	3.9
P 138K	7.7	87.6	4.7	7.2	88.3	4.5	5.9	91.2	2.9	6.2	91.4	2.4
P 140Q	3.7	95.9	0.4	3.1	96.7	0.2	3.6	96.2	0.2	2.9	94.9	2.2
P 18R	5.9	41.9	52.2	4.4	41.2	54.4	3.7	39.1	57.2	3.3	42.3	54.4
Average	21.2	53.9	24.9	25.4	55.9	18.7	24.7	56.8	18.4	25.6	56.0	18.4

Per Cent of Puerto Rican, Negro, and Other Pupils on Register in Eleven Elementary Schools Designated as More Effective Schools at Start of 1964-1965 School Year October 1964 Through October 1966

P 11M	-	-	-	62.8	6.8	30.4	52.8	9.8	37.2	55.1	12.7	32.2
P 146M*	-	-	-	-	-	-	51.1	41.2	7.7	53.5	37.7	8.8
P 168M	-	-	-	52.9	35.9	11.2	61.2	33.2	5.6	68.6	28.3	3.1
P 110X	-	-	-	46.2	51.8	2.0	44.8	52.6	2.6	40.3	57.1	2.6
P 41K*	-	-	-	-	*	-	29.6	67.9	2.5	31.9	65.2	2.9
P 80K	-	-	-	33.8	19.7	46.5	41.3	28.1	30.6	41.2	34.1	24.7
P 165K	-	-	-	12.2	65.8	22.0	15.2	60.1	24.7	15.2	70.7	14.1
P 307K*	-	-	-	-	*	-	30.5	67.4	2.1	20.4	63.2	16.4
P 37Q	-	-	-	1.8	83.4	14.8	8.7	75.5	15.8	7.1	82.5	10.3
P 183Q	-	-	-	12.8	46.4	40.8	14.2	47.3	38.5	14.9	47.5	37.6
P 31R***	-	-	-	6.3	47.7	46.0	7.3	50.5	42.2	7.4	50.2	42.4
Average				31.5	43.6	24.9	32.4	48.5	19.0	33.4	49.8	16.8

*Data unavailable; school not opened at time of special census

**Formerly P24K

***Formerly P17R

Per Pupil Costs of Instruction Proper

Tables 4 and 5 present data on costs per pupil in average daily attendance for instruction proper for the 1965-66, and 1966-67 school years for the ten More Effective Schools established in September 1964; the eleven More Effective Schools established in September 1965; and the nine control schools involved in the evaluation. Instruction proper as generally defined, refers to those expenditures for schools directly involved in the day-to-day instructional program within a school. For the purpose of this study, expenditures for instruction proper include all expenditures for salaries of professional personnel carried on school payrolls such as classroom teachers, principals and assistant principals, school secretaries, school aides, etc., and expenditures for supplies and equipment.

Data on salaries were obtained from monthly payrolls available at the Bureau of Finance. Because the preparation of this section took place in May 1967, it was necessary to estimate monthly payroll totals for the period June 1967 through August 1967. Data on 1966-67 allotments for supplies and equipment were obtained from the Office of Elementary Schools and the Office of More Effective Schools. The computed average daily attendance for the 21 More Effective Schools and the nine control schools was for the first six attendance reporting periods for the 1966-67 school year (September 8, 1966 through April 14, 1967).

For the 1966-67 school year, the unit cost per pupil for instruction proper for all schools combined for the ten More Effective Schools established in September 1964, was $898.63. This represents an increase of 4.6 per cent from the previous year. For these ten schools considered separately, the unit cost per pupil for instruction proper ranged from $802.64 for P138K, to $1,106.59

for P154M. Seven schools (P83M, P154M, P1X, P106X, P120K, P138K, P40Q) showed increases in per pupil costs over the previous year while three schools (P100M, P102X, and P18R) showed declines in per pupil costs from the previous year. The schools showing the largest increases in per pupil costs in 1966-67 from the previous year were P154M and P1X where the costs per pupil increased by 17.2 per cent and 15.4 per cent, respectively.

For the eleven More Effective Schools established in September 1965, the unit cost per pupil for instruction proper for all schools combined in 1966-1967 was $932.52, and was almost unchanged from the 1965-1966 per pupil cost figure of $930.55 for all eleven schools combined. Consideration of the eleven schools separately showed that the 1966-1967 per pupil costs ranged from $734.54 for P110X, to $1,184.59 for P11M, and that four schools (P11M, P168M, P41K, and P307K) had per pupil costs for instruction proper in excess of $1,000. Unlike the MES established in September 1964, more schools of the MES established in September 1965 showed declines than increases in per pupil costs in 1966-1967. In all, seven schools (P146M, P110X, P80K, P165K, P30K, P37Q, P31R) showed declines in 1966-1967 per pupil costs while four schools (P11M, P168M, P41K, P183Q) showed increases in per pupil costs. The school showing the largest increase in per pupil cost of instruction proper in 1966-1967 from the previous year was P41K (20.2 per cent).

Again, the eleven MES established in September 1965, continued to have higher per pupil costs for instruction proper in 1966-1967 than the ten MES established in September 1964. For all schools combined the 1966-1967 per pupil costs for the eleven newer MES was $932.52, while for the ten older MES it was $898.63, a difference of $33.89. However, this difference was considerably less than that found for the 1965-1966 school year. During that year the per pupil cost of instruction proper for the eleven newer MES was $930.55, while for the ten older MES it was $859.38, a difference of $71.17 per pupil.

The data on expenditures and per pupil costs of instruction proper for the nine control schools for both the 1965-1966 and 1966-1967 school years offer a striking contrast to the per pupil costs obtained for the 21 MES. For the 1966-1967 school year, the cost per pupil for instruction proper for all nine schools combined was $485.68, and was approximately one-half of what it was in either the ten older MES combined or the eleven newer MES combined. Of the control schools, P171Q had the highest per pupil cost for instruction proper ($635.59); yet each of the 21 MES exceeded this cost by considerable amounts. Analysis of the 1965-1966 expenditures and per pupil cost data for the nine control schools produced generally the same findings. For all nine control schools combined, the costs per pupil for instruction proper were again, approximately, one-half of what they were for the ten older MES and eleven newer MES combined. School by school analysis also showed that in each of the 21 MES, per pupil costs of instruction proper considerably exceeded the highest per pupil cost in the control schools.

It may be concluded that the high level of expenditures and per pupil cost of instruction proper in the 21 MES reported for the 1965-1966 school year is being maintained inthe 1966-1967 school year. Also, the striking differences between those higher per pupil costs in the 21 MES and those in the nine control schools, first reported in 1965-1966, have continued in 1966-1967.

Table 4

Expenditures for Salaries and Supplies and Equipment, Average Daily Attendance, and Per Pupil Cost of Instruction Proper, School Years, 1965-1966 and 1966-1967. Ten MES Schools Established in the Fall of 1964

	1965-1966					1966-1967				
School	Salaries	Supplies and Equipment	Total Expenditures	ADA[a]	Per Pupil Costs	Salaries	Supplies and Equipment	Total Expenditures	ADA[a]	Per Pupil Costs
P83M	$769,432	$18,516	$787,948	922	$854.60	$770,316	$24,640	$794,956	891	$892.21
P100M	804,319	21,920	826,239	900	918.04	809,413	23,523	832,936	926	899.49
P154M	884,202	21,979	906,181	960	943.94	899,522	25,590	925,112	836	1,106.59
P1X	680,716	16,673	697,479	911	765.62	748,704	25,368	774,072	876	883.64
P102X	605,390	11,810	617,200	680	907.65	630,351	19,572	649,923	787	825.82
P106X	617,098	12,448	629,546	716	879.26	668,079	19,171	687,250	757	907.86
P120K	716,492	20,139	736,631	944	780.32	729,313	26,191	755,504	933	809.76
P138K	881,639	20,855	902,494	1174	768.73	966,911	30,766	997,677	1243	802.64
P40Q	839,445	22,820	862,265	981	878.97	898,778	28,400	927,178	955	970.87
P18R	751,832	16,550	768,382	812	946.28	736,130	23,077	759.207	814	932.69
All Schools Combined	7,550,565	183,800	7,734,365	9,000	859.38	7,857,517	246,298	8,103,815	9018	898.63

Expenditures for Salaries and Supplies and Equipment, Average Daily Attendance, and Per Pupil Cost of Instruction Proper, School Years 1965-1966, and 1966-1967. Eleven MES Schools Established in the Fall of 1965

P11M	$666,509	$31,318	$697,827	685	$1,018.73	$685,668	$28,640	$714,308	603	$1184.59
P146M	741,162	52,169	793,331	826	960.45	753,290	29,481	782,771	835	937.45
P168M	620,634	41,342	661,976	721	918.14	708,119	27,732	735,851	732	1005.26
P110X	622,108	41,472	663,580	898	738.95	661,707	31,695	693,402	944	734.54
P41K	644,011	45,116	689,127	789	873,42	679,789	33,966	713,755	680	1049.64
P80K	325,686	21,839	347,525	385	902.66	341,650	16,902	358,552	409	876.66
P165K	525,837	38,953	564,790	651	867.57	546,843	24,130	570,973	673	848.40
P307K	588,313	49,101	637,414	482	1,322.43	623,091	25,737	648,828	632	1026.63
P37Q	430,828	28,563	459,391	479	959.06	459,140	19,326	478,466	536	892.66
P183Q	677,370	35,076	712,446	783	909.89	689,168	27,609	716,777	776	923.68
P31R	500,782	40,019	540,891	576	939.05	543,867	21,419	565,286	664	851.33
All Schools Combined	6,343,240	425,058	6,768,298	7,275	930.55	6,692,332	286,637	6,978,969	7,484	932.52

[a] First six attendance reporting periods

Table 5

Expenditures for Salaries and Supplies and Equipment, Average Daily Attendance and Per Pupil Cost of Instruction Proper, School Years 1965-1966, and 1966-1967. Nine Control Schools

	1965-1966					1966-1967				
School	Salaries	Supplies and Equipment	Total	Average Daily Attendance	Per Pupil Cost	Salaries	Supplies and Equipment	Total	ADA*	Per Pupil Cost
P144M	$460,406	$14,476	$474,882	813	$ 584.11	$469,546	$ 14,102	$ 483,648	768	$629.75
P161K	436,733	16,333	453,066	1,167	388.23	480,120	16,007	496,127	1,310	378.72
P29X	749,512	30,807	780,319	1,887	413.52	878,975	29,124	908,099	2,052	442.54
P93X	403,636	13,341	416,977	1,017	410.00	432,876	15,617	448,493	1,015	441.87
P167K	563,688	15,954	579,642	1,399	414.33	555,841	23,287	579,128	1,418	408.41
P184K	508,802	28,488	537,290	1,221	440.04	534,512	19,696	554,208	1,024	541.22
P250K	503,666	15,257	518,923	1,028	504.79	535,665	15,982	551,647	1,060	520.42
P171Q	439,679	14,680	454,359	657	691.57	481,750	11,469	493,219	776	635.59
P 44R	444,884	13,370	458,254	964	475.37	490,966	16,350	507,316	917	553.23
All Schools Combined	$4,511,006	$162,706	$4,673,712	10,153	$460.33	$4,860,251	$161,634	$5,021,885	10,340	$485.68

*First six attendance reporting periods

Appendix B - INSTRUMENTS

EXPANSION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM

List of Instruments

Individual Lesson Observation Report and Control School B1

Individual Class Observation Report B5

Teacher Behavior Record B10

General Report At The End Of The First Visit B12

Teacher Questionnaire B16

MES Principal's Interview B19

MES Staff Interview B29

My Class - Student Questionnaire B38

My School - Student Questionnaire B39

Observer Questionnaire B40

More Effective Schools

INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT & CONTROL SCHOOLS

School__________ Borough__________ Class__________ Grade________ Date__________

Teacher's name____________________ Sex________ Observer____________________

Length of observation________________ Activities observed____________________

1. Content of lesson observed
    1. Reading
    2. Spelling
    3. Math
    4. Science
    5. Social Studies
    6. Music or Art
    7. Other________________

2. Did you see entire lesson?
    1. Yes
    2. No, I missed beginning
    3. No, I missed end

3. How typical do you think this lesson was of normal functioning in this classroom?
    1. Completely typical
    2. Reasonable approximation
    3. Less than reasonable approximation. Why?____________________

       ____

4. Who taught this lesson?
    1. Regular classroom teacher
    2. "Cluster teacher"
    3. Special staff. Indicate who: ____________________
    4. More than one member of the staff. Indicate who:________________

       ____

5. What amount of planning and organization was evident in this lesson?
    1. Lesson was exceptionally well organized and planned
    2. Lesson was organized and showed evidence of planning
    3. Lesson showed some signs of previous teacher preparation
    4. Lesson showed few or no signs of organization or planning

6. How would you characterize the level of creativity and imagination evidenced in this lesson?
    1. Extremely creative
    2. Moderately creative
    3. Average
    4. Somewhat stereotyped
    5. Very uncreative and stereotyped

7. If you rated the lesson as "moderately" or "extremely creative," please explain the basis for the ratings____

____

____

8. How appropriate was this level of creativity for the group being taught?
   1. Completely appropriate
   2. Somewhat appropriate
   3. Of little appropriateness
   4. Not appropriate

9. To what extent, and how effectively, were teaching aids utilized?
   1. Wide variety used and used creatively and effectively
   2. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively
   3. Some used and used creatively and effectively
   4. Some used but not particularly effectively
   5. Little or no use of teaching aids.

10. To what extent did this lesson refer to earlier material?
    1. Considerable reference to previous lessons
    2. Some reference to previous lessons
    3. No reference to previous lessons
    8. No reason for references to earlier material

11. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for future lessons?
    1. Considerable possibility for continuity
    2. Some opportunity for continuity
    3. Little or no possibility of continuity
    8. Little possibility for continuity in the material

12. To what extend did this lesson lay a foundation for independent work?
    1. Considerable possibility for independent work
    2. Some opportunity for independent work
    3. Little or no possibility for independent work
    8. Little possibility for independent work in the material

13. What use of the child's background and experience was evident in this lesson?
    1. Consistent opportunities for child to relate lesson to his own experience and/or bring experience to lesson
    2. Some opportunity for child to relate lesson to his experience and use experience in lesson
    3. Lesson was remote from the child's experience
    8. Question not applicable. Explain:____
    ____

14. Approximate number of children in teaching unit:______________________________________

15. To what extent could this lesson have been taught with a class size of 30-35?
    1. Larger class size would have completely destroyed lesson effectiveness
    2. Larger class size would have seriously impeded lesson effectiveness
    3. Lesson would have been somewhat less effective in a larger class
    4. Lesson would have been just as effective in a larger class

16. How would you rate teacher's adaptation of response and materials to the number of students?
    1. Excellent adaptation to unit size: at least some things done unique to unit size.
    2. Effective efforts made to utilize group size
    3. Some effort made to adapt to unit size
    4. Little or no effort made to adapt to unit size

17. Was ability grouping employed?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. No relevant observation made. Explain: ____________________

18. Was the lesson group formed from the grade unit?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Not relevant: ______________________________

    ____

Now rate the overall lesson in terms of the criteria underlined:

19. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the quality of instruction?
    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

20. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the amount of material covered?
    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below Average
    5. Extremely poor

21. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the depth of lesson?
    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

22. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the children's interest and enthusiasm?
    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

23. What was the overall participation of children in lesson?
    1. Every or almost every child was actively involved
    2. More than half the class participated
    3. About half of the class participated
    4. Less than half of the children participated
    5. Few children participated in the lesson

24. How would you rate the verbal fluency of the children who participated?
    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

25. How many children raised spontaneous questions?
    1. Every or almost every child
    2. More than half the children
    3. About half the children
    4. Less than half the children
    5. Very few or no children raised spontaneous questions

26. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?
    1. Every or almost every child
    2. More than half the children
    3. About half the children
    4. Less than half the children
    5. Very few or no volunteering

Additional comments on lesson:

More Effective Schools

Pre-Kindergarten / Kindergarten

INDIVIDUAL CLASS OBSERVATION REPORT

School_________Borough______Class_________Grade________Date__________

Teacher's Name____________________________Sex_____Observer___________.

Length of observation______________________Activities observed__________

If this is a joint observation, check here____and record name of other observer

_________________. Joint observations should be reported by each observer without consultation.

1. Content of activity observed.

2. How typical do you think what you saw was of normal functioning in this classroom?

    1. Completely typical
    2. Reasonable approximation
    3. Less than reasonable approximation. Why?_________________

    ____

3. Who conducted this activity

    1. Regular classroom teacher
    2. "Cluster teacher"
    3. Special staff. Indicate who:____________________________
    4. More than one member of the staff. Indicate who:__________

    ____

4. What amount of planning and organization was evident in this class activity?

    1. Activity was exceptionally well organized and planned
    2. Activity was organized and showed evidence of planning
    3. Activity showed some signs of previous teacher preparation
    4. Activity showed few or no signs of organization or planning

5. Was concept development employed?

    1. Yes_____
    2. No______

    Explain:

6. How would you characterize the level of creativity and imagination?

   1. Extremely creative
   2. Moderately creative
   3. Average
   4. Somewhat stereotyped
   5. Very uncreative and stereotyped

7. If you rated the lesson as "moderately" or "extremely creative," please explain the basis for rating ______________________________

   ____

   ____

8. How appropriate was this level of creativity for the group being taught?

   1. Completely appropriate
   2. Somewhat appropriate
   3. Of little appropriateness
   4. Not appropriate

9. What use of the child's background and experience was evident in this lesson?

   1. Consistent opportunities for child to relate lesson to his own experience and/or bring experience to lesson
   2. Some opportunity for child to relate lesson to his experience and use experience in lesson
   3. Lesson was remote from the child's experience
   8. Question not applicable. Explain: ______________________________

   ____

10. To what extent, and how effectively, were teaching aids utilized?

    1. Wide variety used and used creatively and effectively
    2. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively
    3. Some used and used creatively and effectively
    4. Some used but not particularly effectively
    5. Little or no use of teaching aids

11. Approximate number of children in teaching unit: ______________________

12. To what extent could this activity have been carried through with a class size of 30-35?

    1. Larger class size would have completely destroyed effectiveness
    2. Larger class size would have seriously impeded effectiveness
    3. Activity would have been somewhat less effective in a larger class
    4. Activity would have been just as effective in a larger class

13. How would you rate teacher's adaption of response and materials to the number of students?

1. Excellent adaption to unit size: at least some things done unique to unit size.
2. Effective efforts made to utilize group size
3. Some effort made to adapt to unit size
4. Little or no effort made to adapt to unit size

14. How would you rate the amount of material covered?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor
8. Not relevant____

____

15. How would you rate the depth of instruction?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below Average
5. Extremely poor
8. Not relevant____

____

16. How would you rate the activity you have just seen, considering the children's interest and enthusiasm

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor

17. What was the overall participation of children?

1. Every or almost every child was actively involved
2. More than half the class participated
3. About half of the children participated
4. Less than half of the children participated
5. Few children participated in the lesson

18. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?

1. Every or almost every child
2. More than half the children
3. About half the children
4. Less than half the children
5. Very few or no volunteering
8. Not relevant____

____

19. How many children raised spontaneous questions?

    1. Every or almost every child
    2. More than half the children
    3. About half the children
    4. Less than half the children
    5. Very few or no children raised spontaneous questions
    8. Not relevant____

20. How would you describe the teacher's handling of the children's spontaneous questions?

    1. Questions were welcomed and built on
    2. Questions were answered cursorily
    3. Questions were ignored
    4. Questions were repressed

21. How would you rate the verbal fluency of the children who participated?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

22. How would you rate the verbal communication among the children?

    1. Excellent
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below Average
    5. Extremely poor

23. How would you rate the teacher's verbal communication with the children?

    1. Excellent
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below Average
    5. Extremely poor

24. How would you rate the teacher's communication with non-English speaking children?

    1. Excellent
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below Average
    5. Extremely poor
    8. Not relevant____

25. How would you rate the overall quality of instruction?
    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

26. How would you rate the classroom's appearance?
    1. Extremely attractive
    2. Of greater than average attractiveness
    3. Average
    4. Less than average attractiveness
    5. Unattractive

    Additional observation ____________________________________

    ____

27. How would you describe the classroom atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth?
    1. Undisciplined and warm
    2. Undisciplined and cold
    3. Disciplined yet congenial or warm
    4. Disciplined and cold
    5. Overdisciplined yet warm
    6. Overdisciplined and cold

28. How would describe the overall relationship among the children?
    1. Extremely positive
    2. Positive
    3. Average
    4. Negative
    5. Extremely negative

29. How would describe the overall Teacher-Pupil relationship?
    1. Extremely positive
    2. Positive
    3. Average
    4. Negative
    5. Extremely negative

Additional comments on class observed:

TEACHER BEHAVIOR RECORD

School__________ Borough___________ Class_________ Grade______ Date________

Teacher's name_________________________Sex_____ Observer______________________

Length of observation________________ Activities observed______________________

If this is a joint observation, check here______ and record name of other observer ________________. Joint observations should be reported by each observer without consultation.

Instructions: On the basis of teacher behavior observations in the classroom, check one of the seven choices for each of the following categories. A low number indicates that a person is more like the description on the left. A high number indicates that a person is more like the description on the right. Number 4 is midway between each pair of opposite descriptions. Number 4 represents non-extreme, average behavior.

				Mid-Point				
1. Autocratic: told pupils each step to take; gave mandatory directions; intolerant of pupils' ideas	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	___ 4	___ 5	___ 6	___ 7	Democratic: encouraged ideas, opinions, and decisions of pupils; guided without being mandatory
2. Aloof: stiff and formal with pupils; focus on subject matter and routine; pupils as persons ignored	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	___ 4	___ 5	___ 6	___ 7	Responsive: approachable to all students; gave encouragement and spoke to pupils as equals; recognized individual differences
3. Dull: uninteresting monotonous explanations; lacked enthusiasm: not challenging	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	___ 4	___ 5	___ 6	___ 7	Stimulating: held attention of pupils; enthusiastic; interesting and challenging material
4. Partial: slighted or criticized a few pupils, or gave attention and special advantages to a few pupils	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	___ 4	___ 5	___ 6	___ 7	Fair: treated all pupils about equally; distributed attention to many pupils
5. Apathetic: listless; preoccupied; bored by pupils	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	___ 4	___ 5	___ 6	___ 7	Alert: bouyant; constructively busy; wide-awake; interested in class activity
6. Unsympathetic: little concern for personal problems of pupils or pupil failure; impatient with pupils	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	___ 4	___ 5	___ 6	___ 7	Understanding: patient and sympathetic with pupil viewpoints and needs; aware of pupil problems
7. Stereotyped: used routine procedures without variation; unimaginative presentation	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	___ 4	___ 5	___ 6	___ 7	Original: used unique teaching devices; imaginative; had wide variety of illustrations
8. Harsh: hypercritical; cross; sarcastic; scolding	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	___ 4	___ 5	___ 6	___ 7	Kindly: pleasant and helpful to pupils; friendly and concerned

(PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE)

				Mid-Point				
9. Inarticulate: inaudible speech; limited expression; disagreeable voice tone; poor inflection	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fluent: plainly audible speech; good expression; agreeable voice tone; good inflection
10. Unattractive: untidy; inappropriately dressed; poor posture and bearing; distracting personal habits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Attractive: well-groomed and dressed; good posture and bearing; no distracting personal habits
11. Evading: avoided responsibility and decisions; assignments and directions indefinite; help inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Responsible: made required decisions; conscientious; gave definite directions; thorough
12. Erratic: impulsive; uncontrolled; inconsistent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Steady: controlled; stable; consistent; predictable
13. Uncertain: unsure of self; hesitant; timid; faltering; artificial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Confident: sure of self; self-confident; undisturbed by mistakes and/or criticism
14. Excitable: easily disturbed and upset; "jumpy", nervous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Calm: seemed at ease at all times; poised; dignified but not stiff or formal
15. Disorganized: objectives not apparent; explanations not to the point; wasted time; easily distracted from matter at hand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Systematic: careful planning; gave reasonable explanations; objectives apparent; not easily distracted
16. Inflexible: rigid in conforming to routine; made no attempt to adapt materials and activities to individual pupils	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Adaptable: flexible in adapting explanations; individualized materials for pupils as required; adapted activities to pupils
17. Pessimistic: skeptical; unhappy; noted mistakes more than good points; frowned	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Optimistic: cheerful; good-natured; genial; looked on bright side; called attention to good points
18. Immature: naive; self-pitying; demanding; boastful; conceited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Integrated: maintained class as center of activity; kept self out of spotlight; mature; emotionally well controlled
19. Narrow: limited background in subject or material; poor scholarship; incomplete or inaccurate information	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Broad: good background in subject; good scholarship; gave complete and accurate answers to questions

More Effective Schools

General Report at the End of the First Visit

School__________Borough__________Date________Observer____________________

Listed below are some special features of MES classes. Please consider the extent and the effectiveness of their use in the classes which you observed today by circling the number which appropriately corresponds to the scale below:

1. Used widely and used creatively and effectively
2. Used widely but not particularly effectively
3. Some use, and used creatively and effectively
4. Some use, but not particularly effective
5. Opportunity to observe but little or no evidence of use
6. No opportunity to observe

	Rating					
heterogeneous grouping	1	2	3	4	5	6
reduced class size	1	2	3	4	5	6
cluster teaching	1	2	3	4	5	6
teacher assistants	1	2	3	4	5	6
audio-visual material	1	2	3	4	5	6
audio-visual teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6
special instruction in language-arts	1	2	3	4	5	6
special instruction in speech	1	2	3	4	5	6
corrective reading instruction	1	2	3	4	5	6
teaching specialists (indicate)						
________________	1	2	3	4	5	6
________________	1	2	3	4	5	6
________________	1	2	3	4	5	6

teaching aids (indicate)

________________	1	2	3	4	5	6
________________	1	2	3	4	5	6
________________	1	2	3	4	5	6

special methods of class organization (indicate)

________________	1	2	3	4	5	6
________________	1	2	3	4	5	6
________________	1	2	3	4	5	6

1. How would you rate the attractivness of the building

    1. extremely attractive
    2. of greater than average attractiveness
    3. average
    4. of less than average attractiveness
    5. generally unattractive

2. How would you rate the general attractiveness of the classrooms you have seen

    1. consistantly very attractive
    2. most rooms attractive
    3. some classrooms attractive
    4. most of the classrooms were unattractive
    5. classrooms were consistantly unattractive

3. What is the general school climate?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

4. What was the general attitude of the teaching staff toward the children?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

5. How would you rate the attitude of the administrative staff?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

6. How would you rate the attitude of the supplementary teaching and service staff?

   1. extremely positive
   2. positive
   3. average
   4. negative
   5. extremely negative

7. What was the general attitude of the children toward the teaching staff?

   1. extremely positive
   2. positive
   3. average
   4. negative
   5. extremely negative

8. How would you characterize discipline in these classes?

   1. Sufficient control and quiet for excellent learning atmosphere
   2. Sufficient control and quiet for a good learning atmosphere
   3. Sufficient control and quiet for an average learning atmosphere
   4. Lack of sufficient control and quiet for an average learning atmosphere
   5. Too chaotic and noisy for learning.

9. What seemed to be the single most effective feature of MES in the classrooms you visited?

____

____

0. What other effective features did you see?

11. What, if any, special classroom problems do you think are particular to MES, or especially acute in this MES school?

2. If the instruction you have seen was typical of MES schools, how would you feel about having a child of your own enrolled in a MES school.

   1. enthusiastic
   2. definitely positive, but not enthusiastic
   3. slightly positive
   4. slightly negative
   5. strongly negative

13. If these classes were typical of the quality of instruction in all MES schools, how would you feel about the MES program in general?

    1. Retain as is
    2. Slightly change
    3. Strongly modify
    4. Abolish

14. Please give further explanation of your above answer.

15. Assuming the pupil day in the average school costs $X, how much was the pupil day you saw worth?

    1. Less than X
    2. X
    3. 2X

16. Additional general comments.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

To: Teachers in More Effective Schools

From: David J. Fox, Project Coordinator

Re: Evaluation of M.E.S. Program

As you know, we have been studying the More Effective Schools program since last Fall. Many of you have expressed a desire for a chance to voice your reactions to and observations of the M.E.S. program. This will be fulfilled in two ways. The questionnaire below is being sent to all teachers in M.E.S. schools. During the coming weeks we shall conduct more detailed interviews with many of you (with your consent) for additional information.

In both instances all your answers and comments will be held in absolute confidence. Only I and my research staff will ever see any of this material, and none of it will ever be attributed to a specific individual or tied to a school, directly or indirectly, in any of our reports.

Thank you for your cooperation in this important phase of our study.

Name ______________________ Date ______________________

1. M F 2. Age _____ 3. School _______ 4. Borough ______________

5. Position:
Regular classroom teacher____ Class ____ Cluster teacher_____ Grade ____

6. License(s): (please circle) Early Childhood Common Branches

J.H.S. ______________________ Other ______________________
subject

7. Total years of teaching experience _____ 8. Years at this school _______

9. If prior experience: please list the school, borough or city (and state if other than New York), the number of years there, and the subject area and/or position you held in the spaces provided below.

School ____________ Place ____________ No. yrs. ______ Position______

School ____________ Place ____________ No. yrs. ______ Position______

School ____________ Place ____________ No. yrs. ______ Position______

____

____

10. How do you feel about the MES Program in your school? (circle number)

1. Completely positive
2. Strongly positive but not completely
3. Slightly positive
4. Slightly negative
5. Strongly negative but not completely
6. Completely negative

11. Why?

12. Listed below are some special features of MES classes. Please consider the extent and effectiveness of their use in this school by circling the number which appropriately corresponds to the scale below:

1. Used widely and used creatively and effectively
2. Used widely but not particularly effectively
3. Some use, and used creatively and effectively
4. Some use, but not particularly effective
5. Opportunity to observe but little or no evidence of use
6. No opportunity to observe

	Rating					
heterogeneous grouping	1	2	3	4	5	6
reduced class size	1	2	3	4	5	6
cluster teaching	1	2	3	4	5	6
teaching assistants	1	2	3	4	5	6
audio-visual material	1	2	3	4	5	6
audio-visual teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6
special instruction in language-arts	1	2	3	4	5	6
special instruction in speech	1	2	3	4	5	6

(continued on page 3)

corrective reading instruction	1	2	3	4	5	6
science specialist	1	2	3	4	5	6
library specialist	1	2	3	4	5	6
music specialist	1	2	3	4	5	6
art specialist	1	2	3	4	5	6
other teaching specialists in general	1	2	3	4	5	6
teaching aids (indicate)						
____________________	1	2	3	4	5	6
____________________	1	2	3	4	5	6
____________________	1	2	3	4	5	6

13. What do you consider the specific strengths of the Program?

14. What do you consider the specific weaknesses of the Program?

15. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the Program?

16. Additional comments.

17. Are you willing to be interviewed?

Yes ____ No ____

MES PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW

As you know, we are studying the More Effective Schools Program. We would like to ask you a few questions relating to the Program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our reports.

School _______________ Borough ______ Date _____ Interviewer ____________

Principal's Name: ____

(Interviewer fill in) Approx. Age: ______ M ___ F ___ N ___ PR ___ WH ___

1. How long have you been principal at this school? __________________

2. What did you do before becoming principal here? __________________

   At what school? ___________ Where? ______________

   For how long? _____________

3. How long has the MES Program been in operation at your school?

4. Why was your school designated a MES school?

5. How did you feel about the Program when it began? (circle number)

   1) Enthusiastic
   2) Positive, but not enthusiastic
   3) Slightly positive
   4) Slightly negative
   5) Strongly negative

   Why?

6. How do you feel about the Program now? (circle number)

   1) Enthusiastic
   2) Positive, but not enthusiastic
   3) Slightly positive
   4) Slightly negative
   5) Strongly negative

   Why?

7. Were space additions, changes, or adjustments made to accomodate the Program? 1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

8. If yes, what? when?

9. How do you feel about the organizational pattern of MES at your school?

	a) Small Classes	b) Heterog Groupings	c) Homog. Grpg Read.	Math	d) Supplementary Personnel
1) Enthusiastic					
2) Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3) Slightly positive					
4) Slightly negative					
5) Strongly negative					

Why?

10. If other organizational pattern used, explain.

11. What has been the reaction of staff to the Program?

	a. All	b. Most	c. Half	d. Few	e. None
1) Enthusiastic					
2) Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3) Slightly positive					
4) Slightly negative					
5) Strongly negative					

Why?

12. Do they discuss the Program with you? 1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

13. If yes: 1) Frequently _____ 2) Infrequently _____

a) At Conferences _____ b) Staff Meetings _____

c) Private Conversations _____ d) Others _____

14. Are staff workshops, in-service, or other such programs conducted at your school? 1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

15. If yes, what? Who conducts them?

16. How many staff members participate?

1) All 2) Most 3) Half 4) Few

17. How effective do you think they are? (circle number)

1) Extremely effective
2) Moderately effective
3) Slightly effective
4) Not effective

Why?

18. How many teachers took the option to transfer out since MES?

19. Who were these teachers (i.e. age, sex, experience)?

20. How many requested assignments to your school since MES?

21. Who are these teachers (i.e. age, sex, experience)?

22. What do you think would be the reaction of the teachers if the Program were withdrawn?

Why?

23. What has been the reaction of the parents to the Program?

	a. All	b. Most	c. Half	d. Few	e. None
1) Enthusiastic					
2) Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3) Slightly positive					
4) Slightly negative					
5) Strongly negative					

Why?

24. What special programs and activities are conducted to increase the understanding, cooperation, and involvement of the parents?

25. What degree of success do you consider has been achieved by these efforts? (circle number)

1) Substantial 2) Moderate 3) Slight 4) None

26. How many parents participate in school activities? (circle number)

1) Most 2) Half 3) Few 4) None

Why?

27. To what degree is the community involved with the school? (circle number)

1) Substantial 2) Modrate 3) Slight 4) None

Why?

28. Have your contacts with parents increased since MES?

1) Yes _____ 2) NO _____

29. If yes, circle number:

1. Substantially 2. Moderately 3. Slightly

Why?

30. What do you think would be the reaction of the parents if the Program were withdrawn?

31. Have there been changes in attitudes of pupils toward learning and school? 1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

32. If yes: Have these changes been: (circle number)

1) Substantial 2) Moderate 3) Slight

33. Are pupil's attitudes: (circle number)

1) Extremely positive
2) Positive
3) Slightly positive
4) Slightly negative
5) Negative
6) Strongly negative

Why?

34. Has there been a quantitative change in discipline problems since the start of the Program? 1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

35. If yes: Have the problems: 1) Increased _____ 2) Decreased _____

a) Substantially b) Moderately c) Slightly

Why?

36. Have there been changes in the kinds of discipline problems?

1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

37. If yes: Explain

38. Have there been changes in curriculum as a result of the Program?

1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

39. If yes: Have these changes been: (circle number)

1. Substantial 2. Moderate 3. Slight

Specify:

40. Have there been changes in methods of instruction?

1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

41. If yes: Have these changes been: (circle number)

1) Substantial 2) Moderate 3) Slight

Specify:

42. How adequate have the provisions been of special materials and equipment for your use in the Program? (circle number)

1) More than adequate
2) Adequate
3) Less than adequate
4) Nonexistent

43. How effective do you consider these special materials and equipment? (Consider availability, frequency of use, quality, appropriateness, etc.) (circle number)

1) Very effective
2) Moderately effective
3) Slightly effective
4) Ineffective

Why?

44. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in Language Arts? 1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

45. If yes: are they, 1) Higher _____ 2) Lower _____

a) Substiantially b) Moderately c) Slightly

Why?

46. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in Mathematics? 1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

47. If yes: are they, 1) Higher _____ 2) Lower _____

a) Substantially b) Moderately c) Slightly

Why?

48. In other academic areas (i.e., Social studies, Science, etc.)

1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

49. If yes: are they, 1) Higher _____ 2) Lower _____

a) Substantially b) Moderately c) Slightly

Why?

50. In other areas (i.e., Music, Art, Speech, etc.)

1) Yes _____ 2) NO _____

51. If yes: are they, 1) Higher _____ 2) Lower _____

a) Substantially b) Moderately c) Slightly

Why?

52. What provisions are made for children of high ability?

53. Do you have after-school activities included in the MES Program?

1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

54. If yes, what? (who participates, who staffs, what activities, hours, etc.)

55. How many children are bussed in under the Reverse Open Enrollment Program?

Which grades? ______________________________

From where? ______________________________

56. How has the Program affected your job in particular?

57. Are there things you can do in your job in the MES school which you could not do in a non-MES school?

1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

58. If yes, what?

59. Are there things you can not do in your job in the MES school which you could do in a non-MES school?

1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

60. If yes, what?

61. To what extent do you believe you have been able to implement the MES concept in this school? (circle number)

1) completely 2) considerably, but not completely

3) about halfway 4) less than halfway 5) not at all

62. If less than complete, ask: What has hindered complete implementation?

63. What do you consider the most valuable aspects of the MES Program that you've implemented?

64. What have been your major disappointments in those aspects of the Program you've implemented?

65. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the Program?

66. Do you think the MES Program should be: (circle number)

1) Continued as is
2) Continued with modifications
3) Expanded
4) Expanded with modifications
5) Abolished
6) Undecided

Why?

67. Do you wish to make any additional comments or mention some aspects we may have neglected?

MES PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW

68. Are there features of the MES program which you think could be practically implemented on a city wide basis?

If not, why not?

If yes, which?	How? As now in MES or revised?

MES STAFF INTERVIEW

As you know, we are studying the More Effective Schools Program. We would like to ask you a few questions relating to the Program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our reports.

School ___________ Borough________ Date________ Interviewer_______________

NAME:____

(Interviewer fill in): M___F___ Approx.age______ N___PB___WH___

Regular Classroom Teacher_______________ Class________

Cluster Teacher_____________ Grade_________

Specialist (Specify)____

Years of Experience__________ Years at this school_________

If Prior Experience: At What School_____________________________________

For How Long__________ In what subject area_________________________

Undergraduate Education: Where____

Major_________________________ Minor_____________________________

Graduate Education: Where____

Major_________________________ Minor_____________________________

No. of Credits__________________

1. Would you briefly describe your responsibilities?

MES STAFF INTERVIEW

2. (If at school before MES) Why did you choose to remain?

3. (If came after MES) Did you request appointment here?

   a) Yes________ b) No________

4. If yes, why?

5. How do you feel about the Program now? (circle number)

   1. Enthusiastic
   2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
   3. Slightly positive
   4. Slightly negative
   5. Strongly negative

   WHY?

6. How do you feel about the organizational pattern of MES AT your school?

	a. Small Classes	b. Heterog. Grpg.	c. Homog. Grpg.		d. Supplementary Personnel
			Readg.	Math	
1) Enthusiastic					
2) Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3) Slightly positive					
4) " negative					
5) Strongly "					

WHY?

7. How do you think the other staff members feel about the Program?

	a.Small Classes	b.Heterog. Grpg.	c.Homog.Grpg.		d.Supplementary Personnel
			Readg.	Math	
1) Enthusiastic					
2) Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3) Slightly positive					
4) " negative					
5) Strongly "					
6) Don't know					

WHY?

8. Have there been changes in curriculum as a result of the Program?

1) Yes__________ 2) No__________ 3) Don't know__________

9. If yes, have these changes been: (circle number)

1. Substantial 2. Moderate 3. Slight

Specify:

10. Have there been changes in (your) methods of instruction?

1) Yes__________ 2) No__________

11. If yes, have these changes been: (circle number)

1. Substantial 2. Moderate 3. Slight

Specify:

12. Have provisions of special materials and equipment for your use in the Program been: (circle number)

1) More than adequate
2) Adequate
3) Less than adequate
4) Non-existent

13. How effective do you consider these special materials and equipment? (Consider availability, frequency of use, quality, appropriateness etc.) (circle number)

1) Very effective
2) Moderately effective
3) Slightly effective
4) Ineffective

WHY?

14. Which of the orientation, workshop, in-service or other such programs have you found most helpful? Specify and explain.

(Interviewer) 1) If none available, check________

2) If available, but does not participate, Check________

15. How do you think the parents feel About the Program?

	a. All	b. Most	c. Half	d. Few	e. None
1) Enthusiastic					
2) Positive, but not enthusiastic					
3) Slightly positive					
4) " negative					
5) Strongly "					
6) Don't know					

WHY?

16. Have your contacts with parent increased since the start of the Program? 1) Yes_______ 2) No_______

17. If yes: (circle number)

1. Substantially 2. Moderately 3. Slightly

WHY?

18. Have there been changes in attitudes of pupils toward learning and school? 1) Yes_______ 2) No_______ 3) Don't know_______

19. If yes: Have these changes been: (circle number)

1. Substantial 2. Moderate 3. Slight

20. Are pupils' attitudes: (circle number)

1) Extremely Positive
2) Positive
3) Slightly positive
4) " negative
5) Negative

WHY?

21. Has there been a quantitative change in discipline problems?

1) Yes_______ 2) No_______ 3) Don't know_______

22. If yes: Have the problems: 1) Increased_______ 2) Decreased_______

a. Substantially b. Moderately b. Slightly

WHY?

23. Have there been changes in the kinds of discipline problems?

1) Yes_______ 2) No_______ 3) Don't know_______

24. If yes, explain

25. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in Language Arts?

1) Yes_______ 2) No_______ 3) Don't know_______

26. If yes, are they: 1) Higher_______ 2) Lower_______

a. Substantially b. Moderately c. Slightly

WHY?

27. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in Mathematics?

1) Yes_______ 2) No_______ 3) Don't know_______

28. If yes, are they: 1) Higher_______ 2) Lower_______

a. Substantially b. Moderately c. Slightly

WHY?

29. In Other Academic Areas, (i.e., Social Studies, Science)

1) Yes_______ 2) No_______ 3) Don't know_______

30. If yes, are they: 1) Higher_______ 2) Lower_______

a. Substantially b. Moderately c. Slightly

WHY?

MES STAFF INTERVIEW

31. In Other Areas (i.e., Music, Art, Speech, Etc.)

1) Yes________ 2) No________ 3) Don't know________

a. Substantially b. Moderately c. Slightly

WHY?

32. How has the Program affected your job in particular?

33. Are there things you can do in your job in the MES school which you could not do in a non-MES school? 1) Yes________ 2) No________

34. If yes, what?

35. Are there things you can not do in your job in the MES school which you could do in a non-MES school? 1) Yes________ 2) No________

36. If yes, what?

37. To what extent do you believe you have been able to implement the MES concept in this school? (circle number)

1) Completely
2) Considerably, but not completely
3) About halfway
4) Less than halfway

38. If less than complete, ask: What, has hindered complete implementation?

39. What do you consider the most valuable aspects of the MES Program that you have implemented?

40. What have been your major disappointments in those aspects of the Program?

41. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the Program?

42. Do you think the Program should be: (circle number)

1) Continued as is
2) Continued with modifications
3) Expanded " "
4) Expanded as is
5) Abolished
6) Undecided

WHY?

43. Do you wish to add some comments or stress some points relating to your particular area?

44. Additional general comments?

45. Are there features of the MES program which you think could be practically implemented on a city wide basis?

If not, why not?

If yes, which?	How? As now in MES or revised?

Name______________________________Class__________School____________________

MY CLASS

We would like to find out how you feel about your class. Here are 20 sentences about a class. I am going to read each sentence to you. You are to ask yourself, "Does this sentence tell about my class?" Then mark the answer you like best. Do it like this:

A. I go to school (Yes) No I'm not sure

B. We go to school on Saturday Yes No I'm not sure

---

1. It is hard to make real friends in this class...... Yes No I'm not sure
2. Nearly everyone in this class wants to work hard... Yes No I'm not sure
3. The children in this class are happy and pleased when you do something for them..................... Yes No I'm not sure
4. Many children in this class are not fair........... Yes No I'm not sure
5. We need a better classroom to do our best work..... Yes No I'm not sure
6. Nearly everyone minds his or her own business...... Yes No I'm not sure
7. You can really have a good time in this class...... Yes No I'm not sure
8. This would be a good class if it weren't for one or two children.................................. Yes No I'm not sure
9. Everyone tries to keep the classroom looking nice.. Yes No I'm not sure
10. We don't have a lot of the things we need to do our best work.................................. Yes No I'm not sure
11. The children in this class are pretty mean......... Yes No I'm not sure
12. A lot of children in this class don't like to do things together................................ Yes No I'm not sure
13. Everyone gets a chance to show what he or she can do.. Yes No I'm not sure
14. Nearly everyone in this class is polite........... Yes No I'm not sure
15. I don't feel as if I belong in this class.......... Yes No I'm not sure
16. Most of the children in this class do not want to try anything new................................ Yes No I'm not sure
17. Nearly everyone in this class can do a good job if he or she tries................................ Yes No I'm not sure
18. A lot of the children look down on others in the class.. Yes No I'm not sure
19. You can trust almost everyone in this class........ Yes No I'm not sure
20. We do a lot of interesting things in this class.... Yes No I'm not sure

Ed. Prac. Div.-Title I Evaluation

Name________________________ Class____________ School________________

MY SCHOOL

We would like you to find out how you feel about your school. Here are some things that some boys and girls say about their school. Are these things true about your school? If they are very true for your school, circle the big "YES!" If they are pretty much true, but not so very true, circle the little "yes." If they are mostly not true, but are a little true, circle the little "no." If they are not at all true, circle the big "NO!"

1. The teachers in this school want to help you. YES! yes no NO!
2. The teachers in this school expect you to work too hard. YES! yes no NO!
3. The teachers in this school are really interested in you. YES! yes no NO!
4. The teachers in this school know how to explain things clearly. YES! yes no NO!
5. The teachers in this school are fair and square. YES! yes no NO!
6. The boys and girls in this school fight too much. YES! yes no NO!
7. This school has good lunches in the cafeteria. YES! yes no NO!
8. This school building is a pleasant place. YES! yes no NO!
9. The principal in this school is friendly. YES! yes no NO!
10. The work at this school is too hard. YES! yes no NO!
11. What I am learning will be useful to me. YES! yes no NO!
12. The trip to and from school is too long. YES! yes no NO!
13. I wish I didn't have to go to school at all. YES! yes no NO!
14. This is the best school I know. YES! yes no NO!
15. The work at this school is too easy. YES! yes no NO!
16. I work hard in school but don't seem to get anywhere. YES! yes no NO!
17. I've learned more this year than any earlier year. YES! yes no NO!

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Observer ____

School ________ Borough ____________ Date of Visit __________

Based on your first visit to __________ please indicate in the space below your subjective overall impression of the following:

The School

The Teachers

Quality of Instruction

The Children

Supplementary Services

Appendix C - Research Staff

Staff:

Dr. David J. Fox, Evaluation Chairman
Associate Professor
Coordinator of Research and Institute Grants
School of Education
College of City of New York

Dr. Willard G. Adams
Assoc. Professor
School of Education
College of City of New York

Mr. Carl W. Andrews, Jr.
Headmaster, Collegiate School

Dr. Augustine Brezina
Asst. Professor
School of Education
College of City of New York

Debora Brink
Lecturer
Social & Psychological Foundations
College of City of New York

Dr. B. Marian Brooks
Department of Elementary Education
College of City of New York

Dr. Frederic L. Callahan
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College

Dr. Dorothy Cohen
Senior Faculty
Graduate Programs
Bank St. College of Education

Dr. Harold Davis
Assistant Professor
Department of School Services
College of City of New York

Dr. Lorraine K. Diamond
Asst. Professor
Social & Psychological Foundations
College of City of New York

Dr. Miriam Dorn
Instructor
Teachers College
Columbia, University

Mr. Richard G. Durnin
Lecturer
School of Education
College of City of New York

Miss Sophie L. Elam
Assistant Professor
Social and Psychological Foundations
School of Education
College of City of New York

Mr. Richard M. Garten
Headmaster, Trinity School

Mr. Mitchell Gratwick
Headmaster, Horace Mann School

Dr. William M. Greenstadt
Professor of Clinical School
Psychology
Department of School Services
College of City of New York

Dr. Ruth H. Grossman
Assistant Professor of Education
College of City of New York

Dr. George Hammer
Asst. Professor
School of Education
College of City of New York

Mr. Frederick Hill, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education

Dr. Shaun Kelly, Jr.
Associate Professor
Ferkauf Graduate School of
Humanities and Social Sciences

Dr. Lisa Kuhmerker
Asst. Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College

Dr. Lorin McMackin
Associate Professor and
Department Chairman
College of Education
University of Bridgeport

Dr. Samuel J. Meer
Department of School Services
School of Education
College of City of New York

Miss Jean Fair Mitchell
Head - The Brearley School

Joan Platoff
Lecturer
School of Education
College of City of New York

Mrs. Joan Raim
Lecturer
Department of Education
College of City

Dr. Gerhardt E. Rast
Director of Research and
Curriculum
University of Bridgeport

Dr. Julius Rosen
Asst. Professor
School of Education
College of City of New York

Dr. Sol Schwartz
Assistant Professor of Education
College of City of New York

Mrs. Peggy M. Schwarz
Instructor, Elementary Education
College of City of New York

Dr. Cecily C. Selby
Principal,
Independent Girls Day School

Dr. James J. Shields, Jr.
Assistant Professor
Department of Social and
Psychological Foundations
College of City of New York

Dr. Marvin Siegelman
Associate Professor
Social & Psychological Foundations
School of Education
College of City of New York

Dr. Madelon D. Stent
Assistant Professor of Education
Department of Elementary Education
College of City of New York

Mr. James W. Stern
Headmaster
Columbia Grammar School

Victoria Wagner
Director
Ethical Culture Schools

Mrs. Emmeline Weinberg
Lecturer
School of Education
College of City of New York

Dr. Theresa A. Woodruff
Associate Professor
Department of Elementary Education
School of Education
College of City of New York